Act Number:	09-081	
Bill Number:	6496	
Senate Pages:	2409-2417, 2585-2588	**13**
House Pages:	2935-2978	**44**
Committee:	Education: 23, 71-75, 100, 102, 117-120, 124-125, 128-133, 156-161, 187-190, 192-193, 200-206, 215-217, 263-264, 325-352	**72**
	Page Total:	**129**

H – 1046

CONNECTICUT
GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE

PROCEEDINGS
2009

VOL.52
PART 10
2925 – 3245

Will you remark further on Senate Amendment Schedule A? If not, let me try your minds. All those in favor signify by saying, aye.

REPRESENTATIVES:

Aye.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Opposed, nay.

The ayes have it. The Amendment is adopted.

Will you remark further on the bill as amended? Representative Shapiro.

REP. SHAPIRO (144th):

Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would request that this item be moved to the consent calendar.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Is there objection? Hearing none, this item will be moved to the consent calendar.

The Clerk please call Calendar Number 342?

THE CLERK:

On page 41, Calendar 342, substitute for House Bill Number 6496, AN ACT CONCERNING GREEN CLEANING PRODUCTS IN SCHOOLS, favorable report of the Committee on Appropriations.

SPEAKER DONOVAN:

The distinguished Chairman of the Education

Committee, Representative Fleischmann.

REP. FLEISCHMANN (18th):

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Mr. Speaker.

REP. FLEISCHMANN (18th):

Mr. Speaker, I move acceptance of the Joint Committee's favorable report and passage of the bill.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Question is on acceptance and passage? Will you explain the bill please, sir?

REP. FLEISCHMANN (18th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, the measure now before us would quite simply replace harsh and toxic chemicals used in cleaning products in schools with green products, ones that are biodegradable and completely safe to children and employees who work in our schools. This bill has widespread support from virtually all stakeholders involved in schools. And the only concerns that have been raised about the bill related to a state fiscal impact. And in that spirit, Mr. Speaker, the Clerk is in possession of an amendment, LCO 6407. I would ask that the Clerk please call and I be given permission to summarize.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

The Clerk is in possession of LCO Number 6407, which will be designated House Amendment Schedule A. The Clerk, please call?

THE CLERK:

LCO Number 6407, House A, offered by Representative Fleischmann and Senator Gaffey.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

The gentleman has asked to leave of the chamber to summarize. Is there any objection? Hearing none, please proceed, Representative Fleischmann.

REP. FLEISCHMANN (18th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, while this amendment looks a little complicated, it's actually quite simple. In essence, it removes the State Department of Administrative Services from the bill, and thus, entirely eliminates any cost imposition on the State of Connecticut. In other words, with adoption of this amendment we will have a measure that moves us to green cleaning products without requiring the State Department of Administrative Services to do anything. So I move adoption and ask all members to join me in support of this.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Question is on adoption? Will you remark on house Amendment Schedule A? The gentlemen from New Milford, Representative Chapin.

REP. CHAPIN (67th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A question or two, through you, to the proponent of the amendment?

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Please proceed, sir.

REP. CHAPIN (67th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Last week, I believe, I had the opportunity to look at a draft revision of some of these changes that, I believe, are incorporated in the amendment before us, and if I'm recalling origin -- the original bill would have required the school system mail, the Green Cleaning Products Plan, to each student. Is that correct? Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Representative Fleischmann, Do you care to respond?

REP. FLEISCHMANN (18th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, no. The original measure required notice to parents, but not necessarily through the mails. It could be something

sent home with students. The amendment before us does not speak to that issue, but I will be calling after this amendment a second amendment, of which Representative Giuliano is a co-sponsor, that will go ahead and remove the requirement of such notice from the bill. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Representative Chapin.

REP. CHAPIN (67th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And again, through you, well, in lines 29 and 30 of the amendment before us, it appears that we're striking, for the mailing of notice to. Could the gentleman explain to me what that is referring to if it isn't what he had indicated? Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Representative Fleischmann.

REP. FLEISCHMANN (18th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, I stand corrected. That refers to mailing of a notice that is eliminated if this amendment is adopted. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Representative Chapin.

REP. CHAPIN (67th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and again, through you, so is the intent of the amendment then to eliminate the mailing requirement, but the way that notice would be distributed would be that the student would be given that notice, and I guess, therefore carry home to their parents? Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Representative Fleischmann.

REP. FLEISCHMANN (18th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, I believe the good Representative is correct, that with this amendment there would be no mailing of said notice required.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Representative Chapin.

REP. CHAPIN (67th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and I thank the gentleman for his answers.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Will you remark further on House Amendment Schedule A?

Distinguished Minority Leader, Representative Cafero.

REP. CAFERO (142ND):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A question, through you to the proponent of the bill.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Please proceed, sir.

REP. CAFERO (142ND):

Thank you. Through you Mr. Speaker, and I apologize if this has been asked and answered. Obviously, in this environment we're all concerned about mandates and putting upon our municipalities, our boards of education, mandates that will cost them extra money. Do you see the bill that's before us and the amendment that's before us as doing just that, being an unfunded mandate to our municipalities? Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Representative Fleischmann.

REP. FLEISCHMANN (18th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, no. Our Office of Fiscal Analysis has made it clear that there would no increased cost for any school system, and in fact, there's an expectation that to the extent there is any impact it would be reduced cost for participating districts. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Representative Cafero.

REP. CAFERO (142ND):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. The bill as amended, or purported to be amended by this amendment, is there a consequence if the statute as, I guess, the proponents hope to be passed is not followed? Is there any penalty or consequence? Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Representative Fleischmann.

REP. FLEISCHMANN (18th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, so we're on House Amendment A, and House Amendment A does not, to my knowledge, involve any penalties or consequence. I believe the same is true with the underlying bill. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Representative Cafero.

REP. CAFERO (142ND):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And I'll reserve the rest of my comments for the bill once the amendment is acted upon. Thank you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Thank you, sir.

Remark further on House Amendment Schedule A? Will you remark further on House Amendment Schedule A? If not, let me try your minds. All those in favor signify by saying, aye?

REPRESENTATIVES:

Aye.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Opposed, nay.

The ayes have it. The amendment is adopted.

Representative Fleischmann.

REP. FLEISCHMANN (18th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, the Clerk is in possession of an amendment, LCO Number 6450. I would ask that the Clerk please call and I be given permission to summarize.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

The Clerk is in possession of LCO Number 6450, which will be designated House Amendment Schedule B. Will the Clerk please call?

THE CLERK:

LCO Number 6450, House B, offered by Representatives Fleischmann and Giuliano.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

The gentleman has been asked to leave the Chamber

to summarize. Is there any objection? Hearing none, please proceed, Representative Fleischmann.

REP. FLEISCHMANN (18th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This amendment that was co-authored by my good ranking member, I believe, addresses a concern that some of the chamber might have had regarding the implications of this measure for our local school systems. If this amendment is adopted, it would effectively remove any requirement on the school system to be notifying every single family of the green clean policy. Rather, it would make it clear that such policies would be provided to families, if requested, and if not requested, they would be publicly available via the web site or the district office, but there would be no requirement for notice going out to every home. I move adoption and hope every member will join me in supporting it.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Question is on adoption of House Amendment Schedule B? Representative Chapin.

REP. CHAPIN (67th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the amendment, and I thank both Representatives Fleischmann and Giuliano for

incorporating at least one of my concerns and this. As the Chairman of the Education Committee -- I'm not sure if he's there yet, but he'll soon find out if he's not -- so much stuff will come home in his children's backpacks that, to be able to reduce that, is clearly a good thing, I think, for most people's perspective -- most parents' perspective. I think the change in this amendment to make that plan available upon request is an excellent change, and I encourage my colleagues to support it. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Thank you, sir.

Remark further on House Amendment Schedule B? If not, let me try your minds. All those in favor signify by saying, aye.

REPRESENTATIVES:

Aye.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Opposed, nay.

The ayes have it. The amendment is adopted.

Will you remark further on the bill as amended? Representative Cafero.

REP. CAFERO (142ND):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, again

through you, questions to the proponent of the bill.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Please frame your question, sir.

REP. CAFERO (142ND):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Through you and again Representative Fleischmann, if this was asked and answered, I apologize, but I guess I still don't get or understand the passage of this bill, as now amended. What does it do? What is the effect of the bill? Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Representative Fleischmann.

REP. FLEISCHMANN (18th):

The effect of the bill will be a phase out of all harsh and toxic cleaners in schools in Connecticut over the next two years, replacement of those products with green products, as defined in the bill according to various national and international standards. And our Office of Fiscal Analysis has found that, with the bill now amended by House A and House B, there's no impact whatsoever to the State, and to the extent that there's any impact to school systems, it is either to keep costs as they presently are or to reduce said costs, because of the currently low prices that have

been developed for environmentally safe cleaning products. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Representative Cafero.

REP. CAFERO (142ND):

And through you, Mr. Speaker. I guess what you're saying is, currently school systems are allowed to use cleaning products, frankly as they wish. They could purchase cleaning products whether they be green or otherwise as they wish. Is that correct? Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Representative Fleischmann.

REP. FLEISCHMANN (18th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, yes.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Representative Cafero.

REP. CAFERO (142ND):

And through you, Mr. Speaker, under current law, if a board of education, or even an individual school, for that matter depending on their purchasing practices, decided we are no longer going to use any cleaning products but green cleaning products, is there anything in our current law that prohibits that

from happening? Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Representative Fleischmann.

REP. FLEISCHMANN (18th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. There is nothing that prohibits it nor is there anything that requires it, so in the same way a school district could make that decision, they could also come to the decision that they will use no environmentally friendly products and all sorts of chemicals that have been shown to be dangerous to children through -- and to others who use the buildings. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Representative Cafero.

REP. CAFERO (142ND):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. Is there anything in the bill as amended that incents a school system to use green products? Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Representative Fleischmann.

REP. FLEISCHMANN (18th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, no. This bill sets up a requirement.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Representative Cafero.

REP. CAFERO (142ND):

And therefore, through you, Mr. Speaker, if a school system does not phase out their other than green cleaning products, and they are, I guess -- would they be in violation of this law? Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Representative Fleischmann.

REP. FLEISCHMANN (18th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, yes.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Representative Cafero.

REP. CAFERO (142ND):

Thank you. Through you, Mr. Speaker, what would be the consequence for said school system if they refused to comply with this law? Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Representative Fleischmann.

REP. FLEISCHMANN (18th):

If I may have leave of the Chamber to just do a quick review.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

The House will stand at ease.

Chamber at ease.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

The House will come back to order. Representative Fleischmann.

REP. FLEISCHMANN (18th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Through you, Mr. Speaker, to my recollection, in my review of the bill, there is not a penalty imposed for failure to comply with the statute.

SPEAKER DONOVAN:

Representative Cafero.

REP. CAFERO (142ND):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, so we've established thus far two things, one, every school system in the State of Connecticut, if they so choose, currently, can use green products -- can phase out their current cleaning products and use green products, they can do that now. Secondly, we learned that there is absolutely no incentive for them to use green products because none is contained in the bill as amended. Thirdly, we learned there's no consequence for them if they don't

use green products as prescribed by the bill. So there's no incentive to do so, no penalty for not doing so, and they can do it now.

Through you, Mr. Speaker, another question to the proponent of the bill.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Please proceed.

REP. CAFERO (142ND):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, I guess my question would be the potential cost to the municipality, as commented on by our nonpartisan Office of Fiscal Analysis, according to you is that, based on the market of green products out there, the price is such that if a school system were to switch from a non-green cleaning product to a green clean, or green cleaning product, there would be no increase in cost and therefore, no additional cost to the municipality. Is that correct? Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Representative Fleischmann.

REP. FLEISCHMANN (18th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, yes. I'll just read what our nonpartisan Office found. The -- it is anticipated using cleaning products that meet the

standards outlined in the bill will not result in an additional cost to local and regional boards of education. In some instances green cleaning products have been found to be less expensive than non-green products. That was the finding of our nonpartisan Office, and so it also goes to another question that had been posed by the distinguished Minority Leader. In fact, it appears that the pricing is providing some incentive to our local school systems to move in this direction. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Representative Cafero.

REP. CAFERO (142ND):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, I guess I would say that, if I'm a manufacturer of a green product, and the State of Connecticut has now passed this law, I might say to myself, you know what -- as I sit around the board room looking to maximize profits -- maybe we could get away with raising our price, because now, all the schools are mandated to buy our products. They have no choice.

They have no choice to make an economic decision that might benefit their particular school system because the law says they have to buy green products.

So if we jack up the price a little bit, they still, according to our law, have to buy it. Would that be an incorrect interpretation? Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Representative Fleischmann.

REP. FLEISCHMANN (18th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, the interpretation of the law, I find to be correct. The interpretation of the economics, I would differ with.

Yes, if this is enacted, it will be required that all school systems move in this direction. If we had a monopoly, if we had a single producer of these products, then this sort of poor outcome in terms of pricing that the Minority Leader is concerned about could happen.

We don't have a monopoly, we have actually a very competitive marketplace. So, as I understand economics, what's likely to happen is we are going to have a whole range of different manufacturers who are going to be seeking to get their part of this marketplace, increase their market share. Competition rarely leads to increased prices. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Representative Cafero.

REP. CAFERO (142ND):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I thank the gentleman for his answers.

Ladies and gentlemen of the Chamber, here is the dilemma that we often find ourselves in, we have a bill before us that's entitled An Act Concerning Green Cleaning Products in the Schools, and the bill purports to say, we, all of us, love our environment so much that we're going to take action to make sure that our school systems use clean green products. Now there's not many people that can argue against that general concept, and let's all be very candid with each other, it goes beyond that.

We have certain environmental groups that watch us, properly so, and rate our performance with regard to environment. In this particular case, it's my understanding that these particular environmental groups have focused on this particular bill saying it's something that they want. That therefore, if someone were to vote against it or even attempt to amend it, they would not be considered friendly to the environment.

So being politicians, we want to be known as friendly to the environment, we, many times rush to vote for such bills. However, in this particular case, as I said before, we have learned the following, there is nothing contained in this bill that any school system cannot currently do, they can all decide individually that they will purchase green cleaning products. There is nothing in this bill that incents them to purchase such products. There is nothing in this bill that punishes them if they don't use such products.

So I guess the question is what are we doing? What are we doing? Are we doing a feel good bill? Is it a statement, and does it have any consequence? Because you might say, Look, Cafero, if it is a feel good bill, and it doesn't cost anything, well then vote for it, move on. But here's the problem that we continue to go down, that the road we continue to go down. As a legislature, there are consequences. The hypothetical I gave that all of the sudden manufacturers, of green cleaning products can jack up their prices knowing that now, maybe they don't have a monopoly, but they sure got a hell of a market. 169 towns and municipalities, boards of education are now

mandated -- mandated to use green products, and it wasn't too long ago, I might remind you, that to buy a green product of say the equivalent of an all-purpose spray cleaner was more expensive than buying a non-green product of an all-purpose spray cleaner. So if all of a sudden that happens, and all of a sudden the choices and options for purchase are limited -- limited on behalf -- or to a board of education or a municipality. That's the whole basis of an unfunded mandate. That's what we hear about when we go back to our districts.

Our school systems, our superintendents say, for gosh sakes, stop passing these bills that require us to do more and more and not giving us any money to do it. And I'm not so sure this bill doesn't fall into that category or has the potential to do so.

So at the end of the day I guess we could say, if this bill were to pass, we passed the green cleaning products bill in the schools. Hooray for us. We could do it now. There's nothing to incent them to do it, and there's nothing to punish them if they don't do it, and we still have a big question mark on whether or not this will put an additional cost on our local school boards. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Remark further on the bill as amended? The distinguished Deputy Minority Leader, Representative Hamzy.

REP. HAMZY (78th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Just following up on the questions and answers that were posed by the previous speaker. I sit here and wonder, you know, we put a lot of mandates on municipalities, most of them in the education department. And most of those mandates that we put -- that we impose on municipalities are unfunded. Whether this fits into that category or not, this is a mandate that we're imposing upon municipalities, and I sit here and I ask myself a couple questions. Green cleaning products are good, I think there's a consensus on that. I don't think anyone in this Chamber doesn't want to protect the environment and I don't think anyone in this Chamber doesn't want to protect schoolchildren, but the question that I ask myself, and I assume that most people in this General Assembly sitting here ask themselves, is one of perspective.

Are we to sit here, given the bill as it's being proposed, are we in a better position to make these

types of decisions than people who serve on local boards of education? One of the complaints that I get from people who sit on local boards of education is we tie their hands with the vast majority of the policies that they're allowed to enact. With something like this people who sit on the local boards of education, as has been confirmed in the question and answers that were exchanged previously, are free to do this -- are free to make these types of choices, currently, without a state law mandating them to do so. And indeed there have been several boards of education that have already taken this step, but why does the assumption need to be made that we know more than they do about how to make these types of decisions? That is the question that needs to be asked before we vote on this bill.

As laudable as the goal may seem, as good as this bill may appear to be, why are we so presumptuous to think that we know more than people who serve on local boards of education know about when to adopt this type of standard and the propriety of doing so? I don't presume to know more than they do, and it's for that reason I'll be voting no on this bill, not because I don't love my children who go to school, elementary

school, or not because I don't like the environment as much as any of the advocates for this bill do, but it's the propriety of who makes this decision is what I have an objection to. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Thank you, sir. The gentlewoman from Bolton, Representative Sawyer.

REP. SAWYER (55th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. When you look at the cleaning situations within the schools, you have a multiple type of housekeeping situation -- there are the floors, there are the bathrooms there, which includes the sinks and the lavatories, but there are also the cleaning ducts. And I can tell you a story about the Andover Elementary School that had such a mold problem that sent children to the hospital on a repeated basis because they had to be able -- they were unable to find the right kind of disinfectant, mold killer, to be able to cure the problem. That's a very valid problem when you're talking about cleaning.

Let me suggest another situation, another possibility in your particular schools, perhaps, if you have a shop that is a metalworking shop, perhaps you have a small motor shop, perhaps you have a small

automotive component in which they must have certain types of solvents. Must have in order to be able to work on a particular engine, to be able to clean it, to be able to repair it, because most of the time, ladies and gentlemen, we do not provide these programs with brand new engines. What I can tell you is what we usually provide them with are an open door policy for you or someone that they know to give up a very old engine that doesn't work any longer and requires quite a bit of work to get it back up to speed, but the learning that goes through that process is tremendous, the small engine repair, the small lawn mower repair that I'm talking about.

So if you've done any of that in your own home, you know perhaps the types of solvents that you need to be able to clean off that particular type of gunk. There's a cleaning product that is also called Gunk, I shouldn't say one particular product, but I will. And of course, that stuff gets everywhere, and you have to clean it. And I can tell you, ladies and gentlemen, that most of the cleaning -- green cleaning products do not -- are not the solvents that are needed in this particular situation.

The last I would like to bring up is in the

cooking school areas in some of our high schools that have fabulous programs for culinary arts, our own State Department of Public Health recommends a very, very weak solution of bleach and water to kill the bacteria. They recommend it for restaurants, and it's also recommended for these cooking programs. So because of those reasons, although I applaud the thought behind this bill, and I believe in green cleaning products where appropriate, and also in this particular bill, it does -- I don't believe that it also mentions the issue of our own state schools. For our tech schools, they have been left out.

I'll be voting no. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Thank you, madam. Gentleman from New Caanan, Representative Hetherington.

REP. HETHERINGTON (125th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. If I may direct a question or two to the proponent.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Please proceed, sir.

REP. HETHERINGTON (125th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. Is there a list of green products that would satisfy this law? Through

you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Representative Fleischmann.

REP. FLEISCHMANN (18th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. The bill itself does not create such a list. Rather, it references such lists that are already in existence through certifying agencies, a much better approach to legislation since it allows for the modification of these lists over time. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Representative Hetherington.

REP. HETHERINGTON (125th):

Thank you. Through you, Mr. Speaker, are those lists produced by a government agency? Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Representative Fleischmann.

REP. FLEISCHMANN (18th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. I believe that, at the federal level, the Environmental Protection Agency develops one such list, and I know that there are certifying agencies that are nongovernmental that also develop such lists. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Representative Hetherington.

REP. HETHERINGTON (125th):

So, through you, Mr. Speaker. Anything that is on one of those lists, whether it's by a government agency or by a nongovernment agency would suffice if it is labeled green? Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Representative Fleischmann.

REP. FLEISCHMANN (18th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. Anything on the lists specified by the bill would qualify. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Representative Hetherington.

REP. HETHERINGTON (125th):

But we don't designate in the bill what was lists govern. So presumably this is a, potentially a changing list, or lists. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Representative Fleischmann.

REP. FLEISCHMANN (18th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, yes, and that is the case by intent. If, by contrast we were to try and

create a list today that we wrote into statute and next week a new entrant into this marketplace had a perfectly green product that we hadn't specifically mentioned in the bill, we would be caught in a strange bind where there would be a product that was precisely what we wanted, but it would not be permissible. So this more elastic approach is one we've taken here and that we take in many bills, so as to reflect changes that happen in the world. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER DONOVAN:

Representative Hetherington.

REP. HETHERINGTON (125th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, is there a common element among the products currently in use or potentially in use that we want to eliminate? Through you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER DONOVAN:

Representative Fleischmann.

REP. FLEISCHMANN (18th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, there are actually a large number of chemicals that are -- had been shown to be toxic, have been shown to bioaccumulate, have been shown to affect children's and adult's lung function some among them, pthalates, glycol ethers,

ethanolamines, ordinary ammonium compounds, formaldehyde and benzene. Those harsh chemicals and many others are found in the cleaning products that would be outlawed under this measure. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

Deputy Speaker Godfrey in the Chair.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Representative Hetherington.

REP. HETHERINGTON (125th):

Thank you. Through you, Mr. Speaker, are we dissatisfied that the local school boards have taken sufficient initiative on their own to move towards safer, more environmentally friendly products?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Representative Fleischmann.

REP. FLEISCHMANN (18th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, no.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Representative Hetherington.

REP. HETHERINGTON (125th):

I see. Now if this is put into effect, I believe

that an earlier response was offered by the good gentlemen that there is no penalty for not complying. I would ask this, however, given that these are described as dangerous chemicals to health, would this bill provide a cause of action for someone who was arguably injured or diseased as a result of the presence of these chemicals in a school that had failed to comply with this requirement?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Representative Fleischmann.

REP. FLEISCHMANN (18th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, I'm not sure.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Representative Hetherington.

REP. HETHERINGTON (125th):

I see. I thank -- I thank the good gentleman for his answers. Mr. Speaker, I'm concerned about this bill. We seem to be satisfied with the judgment of the local school board's, yet not -- we're now imposing a mandate. I have not heard anything in this discussion as to where the school boards locally have failed. Surely, they have as much concern for the welfare of their children, if not for the environment

that they would adopt the most agreeable substances.

I'm also concerned about the effect on the liability of our school board members, on which the proponent commented that he was not sure. Well, let me offer this scenario, it's a relatively simple one, someone attends a school, gets sick, the school has shown to have not adopted one of these products in its cleaning services. The allegations is made that the presence of a dangerous substance created the disease and I suggest that there is a basis for liability on the part of individual school board members. So if we adopt this, go back and tell your local school board members that by serving their communities on the local school board, they're now exposing themselves personally to liability for failing to adopt one of the authorized products and for the consequences alleged to have resulted from that failure.

In summery, Mr. Speaker, I would submit that there is no indication of need for this other than a kind of free-floating lack of faith in our local school boards. There is no indication that the desired result is lacking or must be lacking under the present system because the school boards have the freedom to buy these. I would rather see an

educational system to give the school boards the advice and opportunity to do this. And finally, that this is another mandate and I -- that not only it has a direct cost, but has a consequence in providing a cause of action for damages against citizens who serve up a local school boards and I guess, my advice would be to go back and review the insurance provided by the town board members who serve on their school boards.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Thank you, sir. The gentleman from Stratford, Representative Miller.

REP. MILLER (122nd):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Just by way of comments and maybe a question after, some of the hazardous materials that we were just were told that exists in some of the cleaning products, benzene, formaldehyde, toluene, some of those products, we breathe those every single day. Those are in the exhausts of diesels, of gasoline powered cars, heating oil and industrial fuels. So we breathe those every single day of our lives. We could keep them out of the school, but we're not going to keep them out of the lungs of the children as they go outside. The bill

says that the board of education would be involved with the decision has to clean products that would be used in schools. Now, our board of education have all they can do to make sure that the schools are run properly and everybody is in tuned to what they should be doing through the board of education.

I would think that maybe, if we have somebody -- the Department of Environmental Protection on a local level, these are the people that should be the ones that make this kind of decision because they're more involved, even the fire department has people who are more in tuned to what hazardous materials are because they do inspections through out community to make sure that commercial businesses aren't using these illegal or these hazardous type of materials.

And just to follow up on the lovely Pam Sawyer's comments about mold, in Fairfield recently, the River Field School, where all my children went, they have a mold problem. And I questioned whether the green products are strong enough to stop mold from appearing in some of our schools. Mold is something that we generally use like a Clorox or a heavy bleach and the hazmat contractors that do come to these schools to remediate the mold in the schools, they use some heavy

duty chemicals as a precaution to make sure that nobody gets sick because of the mold in that particular building.

So in the case of mold, if there's a situation where there is mold in a school, can the school deviate from the green products to something that's a little more powerful to get rid of the mold in that particular school?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Representative Fleischmann.

REP. FLEISCHMANN (18th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, I believe that there are green cleaning products that fall into every category that schools use them for. I also believe that somewhere in this measure there is language that makes it clear that for instances involving efforts to have microbial cleaning or cleaning of bacteriological things like mold, there is an exception allowed.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

REP. MILLER (122nd):

And thank you for that. And just finish up Mr. Speaker, again, I think we have more qualified people outside of the board of education who could

deal with green products and problems we have in schools with regard to bacterial problems, either at the fire department level or somebody in the town that is involved in environment-protection type policies for that town or community. I thank you, Mr. Speaker for the time. And I thank you for your courtesies.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Thank you, sir. The distinguished deputy Minority Leader, Representative Klarides.

REP. KLARIDES (114th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, through you I have a few questions for the proponent of the bill.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Please bring your question, madam.

REP. KLARIDES (114th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. On line 57, I believe, subsection G, it speaks about honor after July 1, 2011, facility managers, custodians and indoor quality committees shall receive training in best cleaning management practices. Through you, Mr. Speaker, is that -- I believe that's still a part of the bill. Is that correct?

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Representative Fleischmann.

REP. FLEISCHMANN (18th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, no. That section was struck by House A.

REP. KLARIDES (114th):

Okay. Thank you very much. I wasn't sure of that with the couple of amendments that we had. You know, I need to associate my remarks with some of my colleagues. This is a very difficult vote and I think that as we mentioned before, I don't know if anybody would disagree with the fact that people should be using this and schools should be using this, especially in schools because our kids are involved. However, as we, each one of us, no matter which side of the aisle we're on, hears day after day about the enormous trouble and pressure we're putting on schools with their mandates and I -- and that's clearly the issue here.

In the Education Committee we actually had OFA and asked them the question about the fiscal note and at the time it was believed to have been no fiscal note. We found out later on that there was. I know the Chair and the ranking member have gone to great lengths and in good faith to strip that out. My problem is I'm not completely convinced that even with

their laudable efforts at the end of the day that will be the case. I'm not really sure how I'm voting on it yet, but those are my concerns. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Thank you, madam. The gentleman from Trumbull, Representative Rowe.

REP. ROWE (123rd):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is an very important concept that we're dealing with. And it's -- the bill in its current form I guess is very similar to one which Representative Klarides and I had filed a couple years back and it didn't make it quite far enough in the process. I think it was probably a little better that this bill, but very similar. If I could just -- I -- as important as I think it is I want to just get a better grip on the mandate aspect of it because that's an important thing as well, obviously. And I've consistently opposed unfunded mandates, my time up here, but if I could, through you, Mr. Speaker, post a couple questions just to make sure my understanding is correct. Thank you. And I'm going through Schedule B and A so forgive me, but can you tell me, I know some of the mandates have been

taken out. Can the chairman tell me what minor mandates we are left with at this point?

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Representative Fleischmann.

REP. FLEISCHMANN (18th):

Mr. Speaker, I guess the way I'd summarize it is this, with House Amendment A and B applied to the measure before us, what's left is a bill that requires a phase in of green cleaning products in lieu of most cleaning products, but allowing for an exception for disinfectants, disinfectant cleaners, sanitizers or other antimicrobial products, so as to address the sorts of concerns that Representative Miller raised. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Representative Rowe.

REP. ROWE (123rd):

Thank you. And so to the extent that we are requiring schools to become green, is the not also true that as technology advances, and these products become more available, that a lot of these products are less expensive than those which the schools are currently using? Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Representative Fleischmann.

REP. FLEISCHMANN (18th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, yes. That has been the finding of both those involved with the measure had our own nonpartisan Office of Fiscal Analysis.

REP. ROWE (123rd):

Thank you, and this is a very important point that I hope this General Assembly takes note of, you know, we, in this body, are guilty of passing unfunded mandates. Although we've been better lately, but we've been guilty of it. This is almost a mandate that's going to save states, rather, municipalities dollars. So I don't know if there's such a thing as a reverse unfunded mandate or not, but that's what this is as I see it. So to summarize the, this bill is imperfect, it's not as good as the Rowe/Klarides bill of a couple years ago, but it deserves passage and I'm looking forward to voting for it. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Thank you, sir. Representative Cafero, your light is on. Am I yes or no? Nobody's is home. All right. And now it's off. And okay. Will you remark further on the bill as amended? Will you remark

further on the bill as amended? If -- Representative Fleischmann.

REP. FLEISCHMANN (18th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Very briefly, Mr. Speaker. I realized in bringing out the bill that I didn't properly thank people on both sides of the aisle that worked hard on this. Up in the Senate chamber, Senate Minority Leader John McKinney has been a strong, helpful advocate as has my co-chair, our senate champion on this measure, Senator Thomas Gaffey. In this chamber on both sides of the aisle there are many members who put a tremendous amount of time. This bill is not just about the environment, it's about health and safety for our children and for the staff and faculty in our schools.

Last, but not least, I'll just observe this, some of the arguments I've heard today about lack of prevention or incentives could have been made when it was time for us to set up requirements about seatbelts and airbags in cars. The reality is that when it comes to public health and safety, sometimes we set up requirements and then once they're in place, everyone realizes how much better they make all of our lives and how much safer they make all of us. I believe

that this bill will fall into that category and I hope all members will join me in supporting it.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Now you're ready for the question. If so, staff and guests please come to the well of the House. Members take your seats. The machine will be open.

THE CLERK:

The House of Representatives is taking a roll call vote. Members to the chamber. The House is taking a roll call vote. Members to the chamber, please.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Have all the members voted? Have all the members voted? If so, the machine will be locked. The Clerk will take a tally. And the Clerk will announce the tally.

THE CLERK:

House bill 6496 as amended by House A and B.

Total Number Voting	143
Necessary for Passage	72
Those voting Yea	124
Those voting Nay	19
Those absent and not voting	8

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

The bill as amended is passed.

Are there any introductions? Representative Hamm.

REP. HAMM (34th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. For purposes of an introduction.

My colleagues in the chamber, I would like to have you join with me in meeting several German Rotarians who are visiting us in the gallery. Every year, District 7980 in Rotary has what they call a group study exchange, which is a vocational experience that lasts three to four weeks. And this year they've chosen to come and visit us in Hartford, so if we could please give them a very warm welcome.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Wilkommen. Very nice to have you here. Thank you very much. Hope you enjoy your day.

Are there any other introductions? If not, we will return to the call of the calendar.

Calendar 377.

THE CLERK:

On page 43, Calendar 377, House Bill Number 6476, AN ACT CONCERNING A PROGRAM REVIEW AND INVESTIGATIONS COMMITTEE PILOT PROGRAM UTILIZING RESULTS-BASED

S – 584

CONNECTICUT
GENERAL ASSEMBLY
SENATE

PROCEEDINGS
2009

VOL. 52
PART 8
2344 - 2636

Thank you, Mr. President. Mr. Clerk.

THE CLERK:

Calendar page 15, Calendar 622, File 513 and 928, substitute for House Bill 6496, AN ACT CONCERNING GREEN CLEANING PRODUCTS IN SCHOOLS as amended by House Amendment Schedule "A" and "B", Favorably Reported, Committees on Education and Appropriations.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Gaffey.

SENATOR GAFFEY:

Thank you, Mr. President. Mr. President, I move acceptance of the Joint Committee's Favorable Report and passage of the bill in concurrence with the House.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, you may proceed.

SENATOR GAFFEY:

Thank you, Mr. President. Mr. President and Members of the Senate, you will recall that in 2003, this General Assembly passed landmark legislation on protecting the indoor air quality of our public schools. We've also passed legislation prohibiting pesticide usage on school grounds, all with the intent of protecting the public health of our school

children, teachers and staff that are in our schools across Connecticut every day. Mr. President, this bill that has been passed by the House of Representatives and is now before us, builds on that momentum and would require by July 1, 2011, school districts across this State to adopt a green cleaning program. A green cleaning program would be a program upon which schools would use, in the every day maintenance of the building, products that are non-toxic. Unfortunately, many products out there on the market today, cleaning products, have chemicals in them; volatile organic compounds, ammonia, chlorine, types of products that are precursors to respiratory problems, asthma and many of the Members of the Circle remember that asthma is one of the -- in fact, the leading cause of absenteeism in our public schools today. The bill has been advocated by the Sierra Club, by the American Lung Association, by the Connecticut State Medical Society, which has enthusiastically endorsed passage of this bill. In fact, the Connecticut State Medical Society said in testimony that 25 percent of the cleaning chemicals used in schools contain those types of ingredients,

including carcinogens and other asthma precursors that promote ill effects on the students and the teachers and the administrators in the public schools today. So with that, Mr. President, I would urge passage of the bill. Thank you, sir.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Gaffey. Further comment on the bill. Senator Debicella.

SENATOR DEBICELLA:

Thank you, Mr. President. Mr. President, through you, some questions to the proponent of the bill.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, you may proceed.

SENATOR DEBICELLA:

Thank you, Mr. President. Mr. President, through you, this bill is intriguing. I actually think it has quite a bit of merit to it, but I just want to clarify for legislative intent, some of the things underneath it. It seems that the bill says that an environmentally preferable cleaning product has to be certified by a DAS approved national and international certification program. Through you, Mr. President, once that certification is complete, how will a school

board know which products are certified or not certified? Is that going to appear on the product itself or do they have to reference a list and then compare it to the product? What mechanism would they use? Through you, Mr. President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Gaffey.

SENATOR GAFFEY:

Thank you, Mr. President. Senator Debicella, that information is readily available today on the DAS website. In fact, all the vocational-technical high schools utilize green cleaning products as well as the state universities. But the information, to answer your question, is right there on the DAS website, in their procurement guidelines.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Debicella.

SENATOR DEBICELLA:

I thank you, Mr. President and I thank Senator Gaffey for that answer. The question I would have on this bill, then, is if our technical high schools are already doing it and if the fiscal note is correct in saying that the products are available at the same

cost or potentially, even cheaper than non-environmentally preferable products, why aren't our schools already using them? Or why do we need to pass a law for this rather than just pointing them in the right direction? Every school board would love to save money and love to be green. Through you, Mr. President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator. Senator Gaffey.

SENATOR GAFFEY:

Thank you, Mr. President. And through you to Senator Debicella, you would think that would be the case. However, we found back in 2003, although districts knew about the prevalence of indoor air problems, districts would often not tend to those problems with the moisture leaking through, the build up of mold, maintenance seems to be the first item cut in the budget, typically, year in and year out. And the old saying holds true, pay me now or pay me later. Although in this case, it's just not a case of a more expensive construction or rehab project down the road. In this case, it's affecting people's health, including our kids. I think that there might be a

lack of knowledge out there. This bill, of course, will require that they get up to speed pretty quick on what types of products these are, the reasons for having green cleaning programs in place and the fact, that, as you mentioned, the cost differential is negligible. Through you, Mr. President.

SENATOR DEBICELLA:

Oh! Wow! A new Mr. President, thank you, Mr. President.

Mr. President, I thank Senator Gaffey for the answers to those questions. You know, and I think, whether this bill passes today or not and whether or not it becomes law, the concept is a good one. And I know I for one, was educated through this process and learning about this bill and will be going back to my schools to recommend that they implement this now, rather than the 2011 date that the bill requires. Because I do believe that this is something. If you can save money and be more green, that's a way to win. Thank you, Mr. President and I thank the Senator for the answers to those questions.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Gaffey.

SENATOR GAFFEY:

Thank you, Mr. President. If there's no -- oh, I'm sorry, I want to yield to Senator McKinney, Mr. President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator McKinney, do you accept the yield?

SENATOR McKINNEY:

Sure, Mr. President. Thank you. It's not just because Senator Gaffey and I chose the same tie color today, although anytime I can align myself with Senator Gaffey, maybe it's a good day.

No, in seriousness, Mr. President, I just wanted to rise in support of the bill. I think there are those who can correctly say that this is a mandate on our towns and cities and it is. I also think it's a mandate without a cost. And I think the evidence is clear that these green cleaning products are, essentially, the same cost as the other products. We've also, I think Senator Gaffey may have mentioned, made provision in the bill so that towns can exhaust the products that they currently have already bought, so there won't be any disposal and waste of money in that respect.

Mr. President, there was a situation which I think folks in the Circle are well familiar with where, in my home town of Fairfield, we actually had to close down a school during the middle of the school year because of toxic mold and other health hazards, which have, actually, cost people their careers and livelihoods. People who are disabled as a result of tremendous health hazards in our schools. This is another small step in making sure that we can do things in a better way, not just for the environment, but I think, more from a public health perspective. And I know many are cautious about mandates, as am I. But I think, in this case, we're actually doing the right thing. Towns and cities can do this on their own right now. And I think once they continue to do this and once they comply with the law, we'll be better off for it and it won't cost any money. I want to thank Senator Gaffey for his work on this, as well as the people in the House; Chris Lyddy, first term State Representative from Newtown. He and I share Newtown together. Happy to see him work hard on this, as well. Thank you, Mr. President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator McKinney. Senator Gaffey.

SENATOR GAFFEY:

Thank you, Mr. President. And I'd also like to thank Senator McKinney for joining in on the leadership of passing this bill, which I'm confident we're about to do. But with that, Mr. President, I would -- if there's no further comment, ask that the bill be moved to the Consent Calendar.

THE CHAIR:

If there's no objection, the bill will be added to the Consent Calendar.

Mr. Clerk.

THE CLERK:

Calendar page 16, Calendar Number 627, AN ACT CONCERNING READMISSION OF STUDENTS, Favorable Report of the Education Committee. HB6567

THE CHAIR:

Senator Gaffey.

SENATOR GAFFEY:

Thank you, Mr. President. Mr. President, I move adoption of the Joint Committee's Favorable Report and passage of the bill in concurrence with the House.

THE CHAIR:

that it be placed on the Consent Calendar.

THE CHAIR:

Without objection, so ordered. Mr. Clerk, would you please return to the call of the Calendar. Mr. Majority Leader.

SENATOR LOONEY:

Thank you, Mr. President. Mr. President, if the Clerk might call the first Consent Calendar.

THE CHAIR:

Mr. Clerk.

THE CLERK:

The roll call has been ordered in the Senate on the Consent Calendar. Will all Senators please return to the Chamber? An immediate roll call has been ordered in the Senate on the Consent Calendar. Will all Senators please return to the Chamber? Mr. President, those items placed on the first Consent Calendar begin on Calendar page 5. Calendar Number 392, House Bill 6433.

Calendar 397, Substitute for House Bill 5915.

Calendar 405, House Bill 5536.

Calendar page 6, Calendar 406, House Bill 5873.

Calendar 457, substitute for House Bill 6264.

Calendar page 12. Calendar Number 599, substitute for House Bill 6463.

Calendar page 13, Calendar 608, House Bill 6640.

Calendar page 14, Calendar 611, substitute for House Bill 6341.

Calendar 612, substitute for House Bill 6286.

Calendar 620, substitute for House Bill 5664.

Calendar page 15, Calendar 622, substitute for House Bill 6496.

Calendar page 16, Calendar 628, House Bill 5809.

Calendar 630, substitute for House Bill 5519.

Calendar page 23, Calendar Number 284, substitute for Senate Bill 290.

Calendar page 24, Calendar 103, Senate Bill 754.

Calendar 120, Senate Bill 818.

Calendar 136, Senate Bill 789.

Calendar page 26, Calendar 179, substitute for Senate Bill 951.

Calendar page 27, Calendar 207, substitute for Senate Bill 950.

Calendar page 29, Calendar 252, substitute for Senate Bill 1068.

Calendar page 34, Calendar Number 420, Senate

Bill 325.

And Calendar page 40, Calendar Number 541, House Bill 6076.

Mr. President, that completes the items placed on the first Consent Calendar.

THE CHAIR:

On the first Consent Calendar, the machine is open.

THE CLERK:

The Senate is now voting by roll call on the Consent Calendar. Will all Senators please return to the Chamber? The Senate is now voting by roll call on the Consent Calendar. Will all Senators please return to the Chamber?

THE CHAIR:

Have all the Senators voted? Seeing that all Senators have voted, the machine will be closed. Clerk, please announce the tally.

THE CLERK:

Motions on adoption to the Consent Calendar, number 1.

Total Number Voting	36
Those voting Yea	36

Those voting Nay 0

Those absent and not voting 0

THE CHAIR:

The Consent Calendar is adopted. Mr. Majority Leader.

SENATOR LOONEY:

Thank you, Mr. President. Mr. President, a few more items to be marked "go." First, Calendar page 29, Calendar 249, House Bill 6185. Calendar page 35, Calendar 424, Senate Bill 1045. Calendar page 36, Calendar 429, Senate Bill 940. Thank you, Mr. President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, sir. Mr. Clerk.

THE CLERK:

Turning to Calendar page 29, Calendar Number 249, Files number 49 and 285, House Bill 6185, AN ACT CONCERNING PENALTIES FOR VIOLATIONS OF CERTAIN PERSONNEL FILE STATUTES as amended by House Amendment, Schedule "A". Favorably Reported, Committee on Labor and Judiciary.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Prague.

JOINT
STANDING
COMMITTEE
HEARINGS

EDUCATION
PART 1
1 – 320

2009
INDEX

I'm curious as to if, let's say, those three schools dissolve, if, in fact, let's say one of those school districts or a third of that school district would be able to establish their own district and what kind of costs that would then have on the state or that town. Would they have their own superintendent, assistant superintendent? Would they have all those -- could they opt in for that option?

REP. MERRILL: Yes. Interestingly, in my own town, we have exactly that kind of situation, and I can certainly see, you know, any one of these towns, they already have K-8 systems or K-6 systems in this situation, but -- which does lead down the path of saying, well, if you're already have a 7 through 12 system, maybe they ought to be looking at a comprehensive K-12 system. These are tiny little towns.

So, there's all kinds of different possibilities that lead you actually to greater efficiencies regionally than less, and certainly those are all options.

REP. LYDDY: Great. Thank you.

SENATOR GAFFEY: Any further questions? Thank you very much. We look forward to working with you on this. Representative Reed? Is Representative Rojas still here? Okay. So we'll go with Representative Rojas, and then we'll go with Commissioner McQuillan after Representative Rojas. Okay? Representative Reed?

REP. REED: Thank you so much, and good afternoon, distinguished Committee members. My name is Lonnie Reed, and I represent the 102nd District, Branford.

I'm here to speak on H.B. 6496, which is An

figure. This has been done before, but the number never jibed (inaudible) numbers out right.

REP. FLEISCHMANN: So there would be one way or another some educational continuity for the children involved perhaps with outreach in places like Norwich Free Academy?

MAURICE Y. BISSON: (Inaudible.)

REP. FLEISCHMANN: Thank you.

SENATOR GAFFEY: Any further questions? Thank you very much, sir. Is Joellen Lawson here? Good afternoon, Joellen. Melanie Johnson. Is Melanie here? Melanie, you'll be next. Please proceed.

JOELLEN LAWSON: Good afternoon, Senator Gaffey, Representative Fleischmann and other members of the Education Committee: My name is Joellen Lawson, and I'm here to testify in strong support of H.B. 6496, An Act Concerning Green Cleaning Products in Schools. I'm speaking to you today as the founder and Honorary President of the Connecticut Foundation for Environmentally Safe Schools, or ConnFESS, as well as a board member for the Healthy Schools Network, Inc., a national 501(c)3 research, information, education and advocacy organization located in Albany, New York.

My written testimony provides details on the ConnFESS mission statement and lists the members of the National Work Group for Green Cleaning and Chemical Policy Reform which is coordinated by the Healthy Schools Network. ConFESS is also an active member of the Coalition for a Safe and Healthy Connecticut, and the coalition has made the passage of

effective and responsible school green clean legislation one of its top three priorities for the 2009 legislative session.

The consensus among the national and state advocacy groups we collaborate with is that successful green clean programs in schools begin with two basic steps. First, the phase-in of safer, affordable and effective cleaning products certified by an independent third party, and the implementation of best cleaning management practices.

Both of these steps can be achieved without additional spending and in some cases while saving money. However, implementing best practices has the greatest potential for saving money because 90 percent of most cleaning budgets is spent on labor costs and only 2 to 5 percent pays for the purchase of cleaning chemicals. Products that are not used effectively and efficiently waste time, chemicals and other resources like water and electricity.

Attached to my testimony are a series of fact sheets. One is entitled Green Cleaning: Best Practices Protect Human Health, the Environment and the Taxpayers' Pocketbooks, which divides beset practices into four key categories: That they save, are cost neutral, have minimal costs or pay for themselves over time. This fact sheet is based primarily on the guidelines and specifications for the procurement and use of environmentally preferable cleaning products written for the New York schools in 2006. These New York guidelines include a beset management practice section that could easily be adopted for Connecticut schools.

Another fact sheet called Green Cleaning In

Schools is Cost Effective provides examples of how school districts across the country have used environmentally preferable cleaning products combined with these best practices that have resulted in cost savings and improved attendance.

H.B. 6496 builds on the beset parts of current green clean policy in Connecticut. That policy, its fundamental language, requires the procurement and use of environmentally preferable products certified by an independent third party. Such precisely defined language is critical because green cleaning has no legal definition on how manufacturers use or abuse it. Independent third party certification ensures product claims about health, safety, cleaning effectiveness and environmental sustainability have been thoroughly verified and will continue to be verified on an ongoing basis.

H.B. 6496 also addresses the most obvious and significant limitation of current green clean policy -- that it only applies to state-owned buildings, and what we like about this bill is it will safeguard students, custodians, and educators in all of Connecticut's secondary and elementary schools who we believe deserve the strongest green clean policy possible.

Within Connecticut, important child advocates including the State Office of Child Advocate, Connecticut PTA and the Connecticut Commission on Children support passage of 6496.

We thank the Cochairs and the members of the Education Committee for their leadership and vision with regard to this important school environmental health issue. The language of this bill demonstrates a clear understanding of the health risks posed by toxic cleaning

chemicals as well as the solutions needed to minimize those risks that are summarized in another fact sheet called Why Are We So Keen on Green Clean Legislation for Schools?

We applaud your awareness of the green clean movement as the emerging standard for cleaning in the 21st century rather than as a passing fad. By raising this bill, you have provided us all with a rare opportunity to establish policy that is simultaneously fiscally responsible, preserve the environment, protects human health, and defends the basic right of all Connecticut students to learn in a school free of preventable health hazards.

Thank you for this opportunity to testify.

REP. FLEISCHMANN: Thank you for your testimony and for your many rhyme schemes around green and clean and scheme. Are there any questions or comments from members of the Committee? Representative Lyddy?

REP. LYDDY: Good afternoon, Ms. Lawson. I just have a quick question as I need to be brought up to speed on the whole green-clean stuff.

The green, it seems as though it's the fad these days to put green on almost everything in our world. We're not talking about, you know, the Clorox that says green on it, right? We're really talking about other products that are certified?

JOELLEN LAWSON: Okay. The independent certification that was part of the executive order and also part of the state law that passed for all state buildings requires the use of either the Green Seal Incorporated, a third party certifier, or EcoLogo. Those are two third party certifying organizations, and

as I said in my testimony, that through going through the Green Seal practice, this is the only way really to ensure a product that claims about health, safety, cleaning effectiveness and environmental sustainability have been verified and will continue to be verified on an ongoing basis.

REP. LYDDY: Great. Thank you so much.

REP. FLEISCHMANN: Are there any other questions for Ms. Lawson? No. Thanks so much for your testimony.

JOELLEN LAWSON: Thank you very much, and thank you for your support on this.

REP. FLEISCHMANN: Absolutely. Melanie Johnston to be followed by Ken Henrici.

MELANIE JOHNSTON: Good afternoon, members of the Committee. I'm Melanie Johnston, Second Selectman for the Town of Hampton. I'm here to speak in opposition to the amendment to 10-63 regarding the regional school dissolution by changing the method of voting.

HB 6493

My primary concern about the proposed change in language is that it targets obviously, as has been stated, specifically the school district of Region 11 by targeting towns with a population of 6,000.

I think that it's just not good governmental policy to target the problems and struggles of one region by changing a state-wide statute. There are other -- I'm sure there was a lot of thought that went into the original statute, a lot of pros and cons about both methods of voting. In other districts, for example, of the district, District 1, there's 700 -- the town of Canaan has 700 citizens, and they're

SENATOR GAFFEY: It's probably going to remain stormy around here for a while.

BARBARA CLAIRE: Yeah.

SENATOR GAFFEY: Thank you very much for your testimony.

BARBARA CLAIRE: Thank you.

SENATOR GAFFEY: Okay. Sue Weisselberg followed by Carolyn Signorelli. Mayor Perez, I'd like you to go after Carol, okay? Thank you. And, I apologize. I didn't have you on the list initially. Susan?

SUSAN WEISSELBERG: Good afternoon, Senator Gaffey, Representative Fleischmann, and members of the Committee. My name is Susan Weisselberg, and I'm here testifying on behalf of Superintendent of Schools Dr. Reginald Mayo from New Haven Public Schools. With me is Bob Canelli, who is the Supervisor of our inter-district magnet program, and Karen de Fur, who is Supervisor of World Languages.

We're speaking to a number of the bills before you today, many of which other speakers have discussed, and I'll a hop, skip and a jump through our testimony.

HB6494
SB942
SB943
HB6496
HB6497
SB946

In terms of Senate Bill 945, An Act Concerning World Language Requirements, we support that legislation. We're already doing this in New Haven, and the written testimony includes a letter from Karen.

In terms of House Bill 6495 on participation of towns and charter schools and inter-district magnets that let students who are within 20 miles participate in those schools, as the district who pays for

SUSAN WEISSELBERG: Thank you. Well --

SENATOR GAFFEY: Now when you say the right thing, you'll really get a star.

SUSAN WEISSELBERG: Yes. We understood the little dilemma we had here, but I do want to flag that in the years where Labor Day is quite late, as it is this coming September -- Labor Day is September 7 -- under this bill, therefore, school would start September 9th, and that's awfully late, so if you're looking for a uniform start date, perhaps it needs to adjust itself depending on Labor Day, and that's what we wanted to point out.

SENATOR GAFFEY: Okay. So you guys wouldn't be opposed to a uniform date regardless of when Labor Day -- I mean, I agree with you it starts a little late, so apparently (inaudible) the first Tuesday in September, whenever that is, or Wednesday, whatever, that's the uniform date for the whole state, you wouldn't oppose that?

SUSAN WEISSELBERG: You know, we -- I think all school districts like to pick their own calendar. Some districts have a February break, some don't, and so on, and so forth, but I think that it would not be a deal breaker for us so long as there was --

SENATOR GAFFEY: You get a star.

SUSAN WEISSELBERG: Thank you. The next bill if House Bill 6496 on green cleaning products. We pride ourselves in New Haven on being pretty green in what we're doing, and our Aldermen are also looking at this. About four years ago, we tried some green products that didn't work out as well, but the industry has

But, thank you for your testimony. I appreciate your coming here and waiting. Would any members of the Committee like to ask Mayor Perez a question? Thank you very much, Mayor.

EDDIE A. PEREZ: Thank you, sir.

SENATOR GAFFEY: Diane Ethier followed by Robert Dubos followed by Bill Burton. Is Bill here? Okay, great. Good afternoon.

DIANE ETHIER: Good afternoon, Senator Gaffey, Representative Fleischmann, and members of the Education Committee. My name is Diane Ethier, and I represent the Connecticut Foundation for Environmentally Safe Schools, ConnFESS. I am testifying today in strong support of Raised Bill 6496, An Act Concerning Green Cleaning Products in Schools.

The use of green cleaning products and practices reduces exposure to toxic chemicals, a critical part in cleaning up the indoor environment in schools.

I'm a retired high school math teacher -- well, as retired as a teacher can be because I'm still teaching adults how to reduce indoor air quality problems and asthma triggers in the schools. I am a National Education Association's representative to the National Institutes of Health Health Information Network's School Subcommittee on the National Asthma Education and Prevention Program.

Representative Reed mentioned that asthma is an epidemic in this country. In fact, asthma is the leading cause of student absenteeism and a leading occupational disease for teachers and custodians alike, that is, they

get asthma while on the job.

The School Subcommittee that I work with teaches people how to deal with asthma-friendly schools. I am also the ConnFESS representative to the Department of Health, Connecticut's Department of Health Connecticut School of Indoor Resource (inaudible). We provide free training to school districts on both the EPA's Indoor Air Quality Tools for Schools program and the Cleaning for Health Program, which someone will be talking to you about in a little while.

The main messages for both the asthma group and the (inaudible) are that if you want good indoor air quality and reduce asthma triggers, that you keep buildings dry, ventilated and clean, and you reduce exposure to chemicals and biological pollutants.

When we do training, one of the main complaints we hear is inadequate housekeeping that fails to remove dirt and dust. School maintenance is routinely underfunded, understaffed, and of course, caught in a budget crisis. It is definitely important to keep schools clean, but the industrial strength cleaners that are currently used in school add to the air pollution themselves. In fact, some of them are so bad that under the U.S. Worker Right to Know Law, school districts are currently required to provide custodians access to the MSDS sheets of all products that they work with to ensure that all cleaning and maintenance products are properly labeled, provide special training to all employees who might be exposed to hazardous products, and have in place a hazardous response plan to deal with chemical spills and accidents.

Green Cleaning reduces environmental and health risks by selling alternative, third-party certified products, by applying these products properly and by implementing maintenance practices that minimize exposure to cleaning products. ConnFESS is glad to see that there is a training component in this law, proposed law. Custodians need to know how to properly apply, mix, dilute and dispose of these new products, and school districts will probably need assistance to transition to effective green cleaning as part of their already required indoor air quality programs. Free Green Cleaning training is currently available from three sources: Vendors of Green Seal products are required to provide it; the Resource Team has a Cleaning for Health Program; and, there is also a Cleaning for Healthy Schools Tool Kit that's available online.

ConnFESS is also pleased that so many of the proposed bill's language is parallel or strengthen the existing language already found in Connecticut laws dealing with indoor air quality, pesticide usage in schools and green cleaning products in state-owned buildings. We were promised when An Act Concerning Indoor Air Quality in Schools passed in 2003 that it was just the first step in providing safe and healthy environments for all school occupants. ConnFESS sees H.B. 6496 as an important second step in the process.

Going back to assisting language that this law mimics, schools are already required to adopt and implement an indoor air quality program, report on actions taken to implement it, and are required in some laces to do five-year inspections. If the school has an adequate or good indoor air quality program, it should

already be dealing with the (inaudible) it should have at this point started transitioning to green cleaning as part of it.

The pesticide laws in Connecticut require notification of parents and staff with a written policy of pesticide applications, and this just adds on the green cleaning policy, also. But, one thing that is missing here is it fails to notify the staff, which is an important thing. It also requires a written policy statement requiring (inaudible) ensures the continuity of green cleaning practices regardless of changes in district management or administration.

Another part of this law also bans consumer products from being brought into the buildings, and this is an essential process of notification. Products brought into schools that have not been certified by an independent third party are a significant barrier to implementing and effective green clean policy, and they are a threat to the health and safety of school occupants.

Thank you very much for this opportunity to testify. I would also like to make one point. I think it was New Haven that mentioned that they wanted the notification on the board or Web site.

SENATOR GAFFEY: Correct.

DIANE ETHIER: That's perfect fine.

SENATOR GAFFEY: Great. Thank you very much for your testimony. Any questions from members of the Committee? Okay. Thank you very much. Appreciate it, Diane.

Robert followed by Bill Burton. Is Cal

towns also join E.O. Smith?

ROBERT DUBOS: I'm not going to speak to that (inaudible) investigate that, and I was told by the Superintendent of Regional District 19 that they could absorb 79 children that we have in grades 7 through 12 -- excuse me -- 9 through 12 without them having to hire one single new teacher, so we know (inaudible), so the tuition money that we would give to them would essentially be all gravy.

REP. JOHNSON: Thank you so much. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

ROBERT DUBOS: You're welcome.

SENATOR GAFFEY: Thank you very much, sir.

ROBERT DUBOS: Thank you.

SENATOR GAFFEY: Bill Burton followed by Cal Heminway. Is Cal back? So, no Cal, eh? So, Lisa, is it Lisa Degos, Degos? Lisa, are you here? How about George Askew. Is George here? George, you will follow Mr. Burton.

BILL BURTON: Good afternoon, Mr. Chairman, and members of the Committee. My name is Bill Burton. I'm Chief Steward of the Connecticut Employees Union Independent -- hi, Deb. You threw me off. I was ready to go, too.

I'm here in support of Bill 6496, An Act Concerning Green Cleaning in schools. The Chief Stewards of my union all got together about a year and a half, two years ago, and decided to have a pilot project. Our members are at the four state universities, also UConn, and the community colleges as well.

We started off with a pilot program at

Southern that's done rather well. All the cleaning that is done by our custodians at that university is entirely green.

There's a couple of things I wanted to talk about, but I want to stay focused on one thing, and that is the cost. The official position of the National Work Group for Green Cleaning and Chemical Policy Reform in Schools is that the process of switching from traditional cleaning products to safer alternatives certified by an independent third party is cost neutral. This work group coordinated by the Healthy Schools Network, Inc., is comprised of the American Federation of Teachers, American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees International, Green Purchasing Institute, Green Schools Initiative, New York State United Teachers Inform, Green Seal, the National Association of School Nurses, the American Lung Association of Maine and Massachusetts, Committee on Occupational Safety and Health, and Massachusetts Healthy Schools.

What we found with these green clean products is that they -- when the directions are followed, they clean rather well, they clean as well if not better than ammonia and/or bleach,and actually less product is used to get the same job done.

I don't have empirical data, but it's, let's say, a gallon of green cleaning product and a gallon of bleach, and the green cleaning product, you won't use a whole gallon. You'll use maybe three-quarters of it.

That's all I have to offer. Thank you for hearing my testimony. Any questions?

SENATOR GAFFEY: Thank you for your testimony. Any

SENATOR GAFFEY: Followed by Cal Heminway.

NANCY SIMCOX: Good afternoon, Senator Gaffey, Representative Fleischmann, Representative Lesser and members of the Education Committee. Thank you for the opportunity to meet with you and provide testimony on this important initiative. My name is Nancy Simcox. I'm a research industrial hygienist at the University of Connecticut Health Center. My area of expertise is occupational environmental health, and I serve on the Connecticut School Indoor Environment Resource Team, the CSIERT which you heard about earlier from other people, and on the board of ConnectiCOSH.

HB6496

I strongly support this bill as an approach which encourages and promotes the use of safer alternatives to toxic chemicals. A green cleaning program can reduce chemical exposures and provide important benefits to the health of our children, teachers, staff and custodians. The program also protects the environment, and my experience in working with school facility directors and custodians shows that they are ready to embrace green cleaning in their schools and are ready to be leaders of the green economy with these new green jobs.

I have worked with some of the organizations that have been mentioned by other speakers, and I want to just emphasize that many of the schools have successfully implemented a green cleaning for health program in their communities, and I worked with the Connecticut Department of Public Health to start implementing modifications to a green cleaning training program so that we could start working with the schools in implementing some

of the steps.

The Cleaning for Health program through the CSIERT was developed to reduce asthma triggers and other health effects from institutional cleaning. Ingredients in common cleaning products have been directly linked to asthma, as you heard before, with custodians experiencing one of the highest rates of occupational asthma. Studies show that 6 out of 100 janitors using traditional cleaning products experience chemical related injuries including burns to their eyes and to their skin, and other health problems linked to cleaning chemicals include chronic respiratory illnesses.

Now, the CSIERT program -- and you have my testimony in front of you, so I'm not going to read it all -- but it is an educational and technical assistance program that helps schools make this transition, and it's provided by trained industrial hygienists from the University of Connecticut Health Center, Yale University and other organizations. And, at the end of the evaluation, the school is provided a checklist with resources and cost-effective recommendations to improve the schools' cleaning practices and products in cost-effective ways.

I've worked with school facility directors across the state to promote the program, and during my evaluations, I've been told by directors how the transition of going green has saved the school money and how helpful custodians have found our training sessions. We have found that the model works effectively through the Connecticut Tools for Schools program because we can focus on the needs of each school district, and the evaluations include head custodians from each school.

By working together on our green cleaning in our school districts and local health departments as well as the building and grounds school associations and the union, who we just heard from, we are improving the health of our school communities and protecting our environment, and I look forward to the passage of this bill and continuing our work with school communities in Connecticut to implement a Cleaning for Health Program.

SENATOR GAFFEY: Thank you very much for your testimony. Are you familiar with what's required by the state itself in the state's own buildings?

NANCY SIMCOX: In the state buildings, yes, I am familiar with that law, yes.

SENATOR GAFFEY: Are you familiar with 4(b)-15(a)?

NANCY SIMCOX: I'm not familiar with those; sorry.

SENATOR GAFFEY: Well, it really sticks in my craw when the state requires things that the state doesn't do itself. Four dash (b) 15(a) requires the state -- the Commissioner of Environmental Protection and DAS to set standards for cleaning products.

NANCY SIMCOX: Right, and --

SENATOR GAFFEY: I'm just wondering because I don't know. Has this been done? Is this in place?

NANCY SIMCOX: Yes, yes.

SENATOR GAFFEY: Is this consistent with the requirements that we have included in this bill?

NANCY SIMCOX: Yes, yes. The Connecticut Department of Administrative Services, what they have done is set criteria, and they define that the state has to use either EcoLogo or Green Field as the requirement for defining environmentally preferable cleaning products.

SENATOR GAFFEY: Okay. So, the requirements in this bill are consistent with what we're doing on state levels?

NANCY SIMCOX: With the Connecticut -- yes. What the state wants. It is consistent with it.

SENATOR GAFFEY: Okay, and do you know --

NANCY SIMCOX: A third party --

SENATOR GAFFEY: -- if training occurred with the custodians on the state level?

NANCY SIMCOX: At the state level, yes, yes. Bill knows. Bill is the one. He's been implementing the program.

SENATOR GAFFEY: That's probably key.

NANCY SIMCOX: Yeah.

SENATOR GAFFEY: If they do not have the training, you throw the whole program out the window.

NANCY SIMCOX: Right, right.

SENATOR GAFFEY: Okay. Very good. Any questions from the -- Representative Lyddy followed by Representative Lesser.

REP. LYDDY: Good evening. About how many school districts have been trained in the --

NANCY SIMCOX: Cleaning for Health?

REP. LYDDY: Yes.

NANCY SIMCOX: Well, the program -- we spent the last year getting our teacher trainees trained so I have been working with -- I probably worked with two to three just to do the training, and now the program kicked off in the fall of this year, so I've done about four to five evaluations, and there's two other industrial hygienists who are also going across the state and doing their evaluations.

SENATOR GAFFEY: So, when you talk about training, you're talking about the evaluation, you're given feedback as to how they currently are doing and what their (inaudible) are?

NANCY SIMCOX: Yes. We have a checklist. We go through it. We talk to them. It gives them a form that tells what works and what doesn't work. They can get back to me and say, you know, Nancy, I want to get another product that can do graffiti, for example. Can you tell me something that can work better that's safer? So, we kind of have this rapport back and forth to help the schools.

SENATOR GAFFEY: And, throughout that evaluation, do you provide any kind of insight as to how much that each step along the way would cost or an alteration in their plans?

NANCY SIMCOX: I don't specifically do cost analysis on them. This is just from them talking to me.

SENATOR GAFFEY: All right. Okay. Representative Lesser?

REP. LESSER: Thank you so much, Mr. Chairman.

It's good to see you, Nancy.

NANCY SIMCOX: Thank you.

REP. LESSER: And, I can testify that not only are you a terrific leader on this, but so is your daughter, Stacia, who is -- I wanted to know just why -- if you could articulate really quickly why it is important that custodian facilities get the training in green cleaning?

NANCY SIMCOX: Well, because a lot of times -- what was happening, I think, and why I kind of took the lead and got involved in this is that there was a lot of misunderstanding on what is green, and a lot of products out there are being touted as green, and so I felt like we needed to kind of look at this and say -- and there's the Healthy (inaudible) Network, which you've already heard about, which has put together this training module, so I went and got myself educated and went through their training and brought it back to Connecticut and said, okay, we need to work with CSIERT, which already has an indoor air quality program, and start getting this going because schools aren't clear on really what is green, and so we kind of walked them through it.

In one school district, we trained 200 custodians.

REP. LESSER: Thank you.

SENATOR GAFFEY: Anything further? Thank you very much for your hard work. We appreciate your coming here today. Cal Heminway followed by Sarah Eagan followed by Christina Ghio. Very well, you'll be third. Cal, good to see you.

CAL HEMINWAY: Good to see you. Members of the Committee as well and my local Representative,

SB942
SB941
SB946
SB943
HB6497
HB6488
HB6492

intentional in how we deal with it.

I would just encourage you to look at some of these foundations and maybe come up with a list of recommendations as to which ones match your model so we can offset some of the costs because there is money out there for these kinds of programs.

ROBIN READ: And, actually, we discussed in the press conference today, there is some money in the stimulus package around this issue, but I'd really like not to deal with it in that way. I'd like to do what you suggested and look at things that worked. Thank you.

SENATOR GAFFEY: Thank you, Robin. Safe flight.

ROBIN READ: Thank you. Thank you very much, and thank you. I hope you will listen to my colleague here.

SENATOR GAFFEY: I shall.

ROBIN READ: On a different issue.

SENATOR GAFFEY: There you go. Martin followed by Alan Cahill.

MARTIN MADOR: Thank you, Senator, for accommodating her.

SENATOR GAFFEY: You're welcome.

MARTIN MADOR: It's such an important issue. I'm Matin Mador. I'm the Legislative and Political Chair of the Connecticut Sierra Club. I'm also the Legislative Co-Chair of the Connecticut Foundation for Environmentally Safe Schools. I am accredited by the U.S. Green Building Council.

HB6496

First, I want to thank the Chairs of the Committee for being so supportive in bringing this legislation to reality and for holding the hearing. You heard a number of people talk about green cleaning for schools already. I'm not going to repeat, at least, I'm going to try not to repeat anything you've already heard, but touch on a couple of new things.

Sierra considers the intentional introduction of toxins into our lives an important environmental issue which is why we are in partnership with ConnFESS, the principal proponent of this legislation. Addressing this issue in state level legislation is both appropriate and necessary.

Starting with PA 03-220, An Act Concerning Indoor Air Quality in Schools, and continuing with PA 07-242, which requires green school construction, Connecticut has gradually instituted requirements to provide healthy, safe and productive environments for children and school staff. H.B. 6496 continues this focus on healthy schools by addressing a key issue of school operation and maintenance.

We've heard a bit about the effects of toxins on children. I won't go through that again, but I do want to address the issue of costs. There have been many case studies which have shown that there is no longer any cost penalty for using these products. They've been on the market for a number of years, and manufacturers have addressed the market issues, and they put these on the market in a no-cost kit, a no cost increase compared to the traditional more toxic things.

However, you need to take into account not just the hard cost of purchasing the products. The science of green buildings have taught us

in addition to the hard cost, consideration of the effects on building occupants is critically important in conducting the economic evaluation. Cleaning products which keep students healthier, enhance academics, raise attendance and keep teachers and staff on the job have enormous cost benefits which must be included in the analysis.

In my testimony, I mention a couple of examples of case studies which have shown these are all cost effective. DAS is already doing this for state office buildings. This would be an extension to schools. If you look at DAS' testimony, you'll see that they have some trepidation about the requirements of this bill, but in fact this bill really asks three agencies to participate in this, DAS, DEP and DPH. I want you to know that we've arranged a meeting with the three agencies on Thursday where we're going to talk about the issues which DAS has raised in their testimony. We see no reason why we can't resolve the issues that they're concerned about, and we expect to be able to come back to this Committee and report that all three agencies are fully on board with the requirements of the legislation, and I think I'll stop there.

SENATOR GAFFEY: Thank you, Martin. Thank you for your advocacy and that of Sierra for this legislation. The last comments you made go back to my question to the previous testifier with regard to the requirements in this bill being consistent with what the state requires. So, I get a little concerned when I hear that DAS -- I haven't located their testimony yet in here -- DAS has some qualms about this legislation passing.

MARTIN MADOR: No. I think they have some qualms

about the requirements for the agency to specify the vendors and the products.

SENATOR GAFFEY: Okay.

MARTIN MADOR: They're really already doing this for state office buildings. They've been doing this for a year, and, in fact, if you clean one floor, it's the same as cleaning another floor no matter what building the floor is located in.

SENATOR GAFFEY: Sure.

MARTIN MADOR: So, it's our expectation that sitting down with them -- we've actually been trying since December to have a sit-down to work out these differences. We now expect that meeting to happen on Thursday. Our knowledge tells us that we should be able to work with both DAS and the other two agencies to resolve the issues that they have. The expertise that DAS may not yet have acquired, we expect to get --to find within the other two agencies, DEP and DPH, so we're very optimistic that we can address DAS' reservations --

SENATOR GAFFEY: Okay.

MARTIN MADOR: -- and eventually they should be resolved, and we don't expect any kind of fiscal note on this bill by the time we're finished talking to each other.

SENATOR GAFFEY: That would be most helpful.

MARTIN MADOR: Well, we understand more than helpful. It's sort of mandatory in a sense.

SENATOR GAFFEY: Right. Chairman Fleischmann?

MARTIN MADOR: We understand that.

REP. FLEISCHMANN: First, I want to reassure you. I think you're in good shape when it comes to the fiscal (inaudible) because I have spoken with people on the fifth floor, and they're aware of the fact that in a lot of instances, there are actually cost savings by switching to these green cleaning products, so I think it should work out okay.

MARTIN MADOR: Thanks so much.

REP. FLEISCHMANN: I thought to ask you a question I haven't put to anyone who's been supportive of this which just relates to efficacy of products. We'll hear from people who are promoting the (inaudible) products that are much less environmentally friendly, much less friendly to those with allergies, that their products work much better and they're not as bad as advertised on these other fronts.

I'm interested just to get your summary of the situation on how effective these green clean products are today.

MARTIN MADOR: Well, my research and the work that my colleagues have done, looking into this, tells us that the green clean products currently on the market really work as well as the traditionally more toxic products, so I'm not an expert in cleaning. Anyone who's lived with me would probably agree with that statement, but our research and what we've heard from what other districts have been doing and the case studies around the country say that these products really are effective, and it should not be a problem.

REP. FLEISCHMANN: Thank you. I appreciate that. I'm no expert in cleaning either, so your

expertise is probably greater than mine is. I appreciate it. Thanks.

SENATOR GAFFEY: Thank you very much. Anything further from members of the Committee? Martin, thank you very much for your testimony.

MARTIN MADOR: Thank you for the time.

SENATOR GAFFEY: You're welcome. Alan Cahill? Is Sherri Rivard Lenz here? Sherri Rivard Lenz? How about -- the first name is spelled J-a-y-a, Jaya? Okay. You'll be after Mr. Cahill, okay? Mr. Cahill, please be seated.

ALAN CAHILL: Thank you. Representative Fleischmann, Senator Gaffey, and members of the Joint Committee, thank you for this privilege. My name is Alan Cahill. I'm the Third Selectman for the town of Hampton, low man on the totem pole. I've also served two terms on the Hampton Elementary Board of Education. I'm a lifelong resident of Hampton, lifelong dairy farmer. HB6493

Hampton is a beautiful place to live. It's one of the most pristine places in the state. From my hilltop farm, you can see into Rhode Island and Massachusetts over 20 miles away. It's a great place to live and raise a family except for our educational system.

Change has been a buzz word in the state in the past national election. Pleas for change are not new in my area and have been asked for for many decades. Regional state statutes as we are governed now block progressive change and even inhibit the dialogue for self improvement. They disfunctionally protect minority rule within the district. To me, this is converse to my civil liberties and

opportunity in the future to support the work of non-profit and university partners as they work together to make the best possible use of student achievement data and to make it widely available to parents, educators, your Committee, and the members of the public.

Given the enormous challenges ahead, I urge you not to forget that private foundations stand ready to partner with the state to support education reform to increase achievement.

Thank you very much for the opportunity to speak.

SENATOR GAFFEY: Thank you very much for staying and testifying. Any questions? Thank you.

NANCY RYAN: Thank you.

SENATOR GAFFEY: Is Chris Leone still here? Chris, you're next. Good evening, Polly.

POLLY T. BAREY: Good evening, Senator Gaffey, and members of the Education Committee. I'm Polly Barey, and I'm here tonight testifying in support of House Bill 6496, the clean products bill. I'm here representing the Connecticut Nurses' Association as well as the Association for School Nurses of Connecticut. The School Nurses are a part of our government relations committee.

You've already heard that we already have a policy in Connecticut related to green cleaning and the way it needs to be done, so that what we're really looking at for this bill is an extension of that into our schools.

Just a couple of highlights from my testimony is the reminder that kids are the majority of

the occupants in schools. Their size, increased metabolic rates and developing organs make them much more vulnerable to exposures to toxic cleaning chemicals. The chemicals contained in conventional cleaners are of concern because of their exposures, and these products may contain carcinogens, which we haven't talked a whole lot about. We talked a lot about asthma, but there definitely are carcinogens, respiratory irritants and asthmagens, and ingredients that are toxic to the central nervous system, reproduction, developmental systems, kidneys and liver.

They can also be irritants to the eyes, nose and throat as well as sensitivities to the skin. The diseases associated with conventional cleaning products are allergies and chemical sensitivities, asthma -- and we've learned about that just in terms of it being one of the leading causes of absenteeism with missed school days, chronic respiratory illnesses as well as some of these products have hormone-disrupting chemicals and the exposure to these in terms of how the endocrine system works results in testicular cancer, reproductive abnormalities and lower sperm count.

I think we've talked about the costs of lost work time, productivity, additional expenses for substitute teachers, potential liability issues, and last but not least, as a nurse, when we practice, we look at risk, and if there's risk and a way to have a safer alternative, that's the direction that we really need to be moving in.

I appreciate you all staying this evening,and I'm available for questions. Thank you.

SENATOR GAFFEY: (Inaudible.)

REP. COOK: Thank you, Senator Gaffey.

SENATOR GAFFEY: You're welcome. Hypo -- not hypothetically, but I'm sure you have some numbers. What is the amount or percentage that you see in the public schools or private schools or overall schools with children having complications from these products?

POLLY T. BAREY: You know, I have the data over there. I can get you some of that because we've had that information for actually when we presented for -- the Coalition for a Safe and Healthy Connecticut actually had a press conference, and we had some data associated with that. I'd be more than happy. I am data-driven, but I don't always have it right here. I would be happy to get it for you, though.

REP. COOK: And, have you been in contact with anybody from the Children's Medical Center to see if there's any follow-up data there with like the infectious disease specialists, and things like that?

POLLY T. BAREY: I haven't been, but we have actually Connecticut Nurses' Association, one of our environmental health nurses works there, and that's something that I could certainly follow up on.

REP. COOK: Personal experience: My daughter has a pneumococcal antibody deficiency which we found that it was related to the environment that she was in. It started when she was in kindergarten, so it's interesting to see -- obviously, and I've dealt with it personally, but the hospital up there was fantastic.

POLLY T. BAREY: Wonderful.

REP. COOK: So, it may be another avenue for numbers for us, going forward, so I thank you for your work.

POLLY T. BAREY: Thank you.

SENATOR GAFFEY: Thank you, Representative Cook. Thank you very much for your testimony.

Chris Leone? Is Michael Pryor still here? Michael Pryor? Is Norman Newman Johnson here? Ann Marie (inaudible)? Okay. Gladys Ellis? Gladys will be next. Please proceed, Chris.

CHRIS LEONE: Thank you, Chairman Gaffey and Committee Members for staying into the evening. I know it's been a long day for each of you.
I'm here tonight as the Director of the Hartford Magnet Schools to discuss three bills.

First of all, to start with, House Bill Number 6491. As Hartford, you've heard, supported and worked closely with ConnCAN and Trinity on the SmartChoices Web site, we strongly support the quick passage of 6491 to encourage collaboration throughout the state.

Additionally, Senate Bill 942, An Act Establishing a Date Certain for Student Notification, we feel this is vital for the region to establish enrollment and staffing patterns when districts are losing students late into December for the October 1 count. This wreaks havoc on school budgets. Hartford alone lost over 400 students after August 1 last year due to the Sheff 2008 stipulated agreement, so we encourage the quick passage of S.B. 942.

I thank you for your time, and I'm here to answer any questions.

SENATOR GAFFEY: Thank you, Chris. Any questions from members of the Committee?

CHRIS LEONE: Thank you very much.

SENATOR GAFFEY: Gladys? Is John Meyers here? John Meyers? Richard de (inaudible)? Sally Biggs? Lauren Valezquez? Lauren is here? Okay, great. You've be next. Gladys, please proceed.

GLADYS ELLIS: Good afternoon. My name is Gladys Ellis, and I want to thank Senator Gaffey, Representative Fleischmann, and the Education Committee for the chance to support H.B. 6496, An Act Concerning Green Cleaning Products in Schools.

As President of North Hartford Seniors in Action, I have helped to organize over a dozen education forums on the green cleaning issue. Many members of North Hartford Seniors including myself now use safer green cleaning products in our homes. In many cases, green products are actually less expensive than the products containing hazardous chemicals that I used to use.

I thank the Legislature for requiring green cleaning in state-owned buildings, but it is time to revisit the issue of the schools. This is important for protecting children's health because so many of our children have asthma, and some of the teachers have it, and as you already know, asthma is one of the top reasons for absenteeism in the schools.

And also important is protecting communities

from pollution. It is unfortunate the communities of color and low income bear a disproportionate share of the adverse impacts of pollution and suffer from more health hazards compared with the general population. Toxic cleaning products are an example of this problem. The chemicals can get into our water system, react with organic materials, and end up in sewage sludge. Even the best incinerators can't capture all of the dioxin and other toxins that are released as a result.

Green cleaning helps solve this problem because less toxic waste is created in the first place. Now that safer green cleaning products are available for schools, I strongly encourage the Committee to do everything in its power to pass this bill quickly and see that it makes it through the Legislature and on to Governor Rell's desk, and if Governor Rell would sign it and if you would pass it, you would see where you could save the state of Connecticut a lot of money. And, that's what everybody is talking about today.

And, unlike the gentleman that spoke before, I no longer use them -- I do use them. I use baking soda, boric acid, and vinegar, and those are my cleaning products.

SENATOR GAFFEY: Thank you, Gladys. When we get this to Governor Rell's desk, we'll have to make sure you're there at the bill signing.

GLADYS ELLIS: Thank you.

SENATOR GAFFEY: I want to see you there, okay?

GLADYS ELLIS: Thank you. I'll be there.

SENATOR GAFFEY: All right, Gladys. Thank you very

and help combat global warming.

We have some concerns over Senate Bill 942, which would provide a May 1st notification date of a student deciding that they're going to participate in an interdistrict magnet school. We've chatted with many of our members, and we have find that most municipal budgets are complete by May 1st, and that there needs to be a much earlier deadline if those costs are to be incorporated into the budgetary process.

SENATOR GAFFEY: Talk to Senator Prague.

KACHINA WALSH-WEAVER: I will.

SENATOR GAFFEY: This emanates from Senator Prague.

KACHINA WALSH-WEAVER: Okay. Thank you.
We also are opposed to House Bill 6492, which would allow boards of education to establish contingency funds. We feel that the local legislative body is the entity that's responsible for the overall budgets and, generally speaking, any excess funds are transferred back to the General Fund. We'd like to keep it that way. We think that is the process that's been in place for a while, and this bill would interfere with that.

HB6494
HB6496

We also have concerns with House Bill 6497 having to do with the educational stability for the children in foster care. We certainly support the genesis of the bill and the intentions behind this; however, as always with special education costs, we have concerns about the fact that the nexus versus non-nexus issue still have not been addressed, and we feel that these students, their special education costs should certainly be paid for by the state.

6494, An Act Concerning Teen Dating Violence Education, again, a very laudable goal; however, we would caution the Committee to carefully consider the impact that any new mandated curriculum has on the local districts Towns are already forced to squeeze a lot of education into a very short period time. There is already mandated ongoing teacher -- I'm tired; sorry -- ongoing teacher training, and this would just add to that, and any new mandated curriculum essentially would take away from any existing curriculum, and so we caution you on that.

And, then, last but not least, 6496, An Act Concerning Green Cleaning Products, we definitely see this as a new unfunded mandate on local governments. I've listened to the people who have testified prior to me, and I understand their positions. However, the reality is that these green cleaning products are not yet at a cost level that is comparable to other traditional products. I purchase them myself for my own home, and I make that decision to pay the extra cost for it.

Training and refresher costs for facility managers, custodians and indoor air quality committees will also have a cost to it, as well as providing notice to parents and posting information on their Web sites. If this is really a good program and what is going on with DAS is working very well and they're able to do a cooperative purchasing program that will reduce the costs and make it affordable to towns, CCM strongly believes that a good education and access to this cooperative purchasing program should more than carry this new program through than having it be mandated on towns.

Thank you.

SENATOR GAFFEY: In regard to your last one, OFA is telling us that there is not much, if any, fiscal impact to the towns, so we're at a disagreement there as far as what OFA has told us so far.

KACHINA WALSH-WEAVER: Okay.

SENATOR GAFFEY: And your testimony. And, so, you know, if you have anything more to add on that, not tonight, but, you know, as we go on, this is a pretty important bill and -- I mean, I'm sensitive to unfunded --I'm very sensitive to unfunded mandates to the towns, but maybe we should have a conversation with OFA so that -- because you have a job to do in reporting back to people on your board and maybe if they understand the analysis that OFA is conducting with regard to the fiscal impact, that maybe they'll be more comfortable with that.

KACHINA WALSH-WEAVER: Right. And, we haven't had an opportunity to talk with the Department of Administrative Services yet,which I -- which I certainly intend to do. I will say that, you know, right off the bat though even if it were to be able to be determined, OFA is looking at the cost of the products themselves, you still have a training and refresher course and there's a cost to that; providing notices to all the teachers and parents and postings on Web sites, there's a cost to that.

SENATOR GAFFEY: Yes, there is, but I guess I look further down the road because this is a cost associated with custodians getting ill and kids getting ill and teachers getting ill because of the products that are used in that environment, so, you know, we have to balance it all out.

KACHINA WALSH-WEAVER: Certainly, and that's why we feel that with a good education to the districts and to teachers and to parents and to students and custodians as well as the DAS expanding their cooperative purchasing program, I really think that would be incentives, significant incentives.

SENATOR GAFFEY: Representative Cook?

REP. COOK: You had said about, you know, notifying the parents via e-mail or mail, or what-have-you, what exactly are you notifying the parents of?

KACHINA WALSH-WEAVER: Well, in the bill, it requires local boards of education to provide notice of what the new green building program is to all parents, and then provide posting on each individual school's Web site about what that program is.

REP. COOK: Okay, but most if not every public school and private school has a Web site that's already established, so that would be a non-cost effective issue; it's a matter of typing in the information and putting it out there.

I'm sure I speak for my PTO that represent the PTO's in Torrington that we send out mailers to people all the time, so by adding a little piece of information onto another mailer would be no cost at all, so that would be another non, you know, non-cost issue, so nobody -- you know, that could be connected to something else, so I think here, you know, you're stating -- and I agree with Senator Gaffey here -- that, you know, we're looking at one way or the other, and you're stating that this is a money issue and an unfunded mandate.

We're stating that there's hundreds and hundreds of children that are becoming so ill and custodians and teachers, they cannot go to school, so I don't see where there is a price here comparable to what children and staff (inaudible) are going through. There's no comparison for me.

KACHINA WALSH-WEAVER: And, I understand that, and unfortunately I think in my very first year of lobbying for CCM, I had to sit before this Committee and testify against the indoor air quality in schools program, and as a parent, I certainly felt kind of heelish in doing it, but what I really dos boil down to for our local districts, especially in this sort of an economic fiscal crisis that we're in, is that they're laying off teachers, and they're furloughing municipal employees, and they're cutting back on their supplies, and no one is saying that the program is not a good idea and does not have potentially excellent benefits down the road. We're just saying that right now we can't take on anything more, and if you were to look at our unfunded mandates reports, there are many, many unfunded mandates that are put on local governments currently.

Right now, floating around the building, there are over several dozen unfunded mandates. Some are of very small significance; some are of huge significance. And, so, we really have to look at all of them as being kind of a big deal because one little one is not a big deal, but a hundred little ones is a huge deal, and, you know, I agree that there are certainly avenues for providing the information out to parents; however, right now, the way the language of the bill is drafted, it requires local boards of education to provide that notice to parents via the mail, which is -- I know they get a bulk discount so you're

talking maybe 35 cents a child for the mailing costs and then the printing costs, and so on, and so forth.

And then, of course, we also -- you know, I'm not aware -- I haven't seen what OFA has put together, but just on personal basis, making the choice personally to purchase certain green products and certain locally grown vegetables and locally grown meats, I made that decision for me to spent that extra money for that because I'm making that choice, but I don't do it with everything, and no one's telling me that that's what I have to do, and if properly educated, as I've been with the locally grown products and certain green products, I've made that choice, and I think if we make those -- if we make those steps in terms of educating local boards of education about what's out there, the products that are out there, and if DAS can demonstrate that they can purchase these products cooperatively for local boards of education at a similar cost or savings, I couldn't imagine any local board not jumping on board with that.

REP. COOK: I believe about six and half hours ago Representative Reed testified, and her school district did do this study.

KACHINA WALSH-WEAVER: Correct.

REP. COOK: And, they found that it was pretty much cost-neutral, that there was no astronomical comparison to one versus the other, and I think that it's our obligation sitting here to make sure that we help these school districts and steer them in the right direction because there's not always those people out there that (inaudible) look in that direction, and back to the whole saving cost thing and mail, I know that our high school specifically mails

out report card. I know that the middle school mails out report cards. I don't think we should base this on the mail factor here.

KACHINA WALSH-WEAVER: Okay.

REP. COOK: And, I do agree that, you know, if we're talking about a cost-neutral thing or pretty much close to it, that this is something we really need to look at. Thank you.

SENATOR GAFFEY: Representative Hornish?

REP. HORNISH: Thank you, Mr. Chair. And as for cleaning products, I know in my home I do buy green products on occasion, and they may cost a premium --I agree with you there -- but fundamentally white vinegar, baking soda, ammonia, those are things that schools could use, that you could make mixes with that, which would be extremely cheap in terms of proper products, so, you know -- and bleach, or whatever -- but that's something that doesn't cost a lot, and that could be -- I would argue against the green products costing necessarily more.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

SENATOR GAFFEY: Thank you, Representative Hornish.

Okay, Kachina.

KACHINA WALSH-WEAVER: Thank you.

SENATOR GAFFEY: That wasn't too bad, was it?

KACHINA WALSH-WEAVER: No, not too bad. The wait was worse.

SENATOR GAFFEY: Tell your family you did great.

especially given our willingness to compensate them, we hope we can figure out a way to do that where it works for them, too.

SENATOR GAFFEY: Okay, good. Any questions? Thank you very much, Alex. Thanks for staying. Joe is here, right, Joe Wasserman. Is Jim Agostine here? Okay, Jim, you're next.

JIIM AGOSTINE: Thank you.

SENATOR GAFFEY: You're welcome.

JOE WASSERMAN: Hi. My name is Joe Wasserman. I'm with Connecticut Coalition for Environmental Justice, and I would like to thank Senator Gaffey, Representative Fleischmann and the Honorable Members of the Education Committee for this opportunity to testify.

Before I begin my testimony, I just want to clarify an issue that was raised before. Because Green Seal, the prime certifying organization, requires that vendors provide no-cost training to ensure proper use of the product to receive their certification, school districts are assured they will receive this training without cost. Is that clear? Okay.

The Connecticut Coalition for Environmental Justice is a grass roots, non-profit organization dedicated to protecting urban environments through educating communities, through promoting changes in public policies and through promoting individual, corporate and government responsibility toward our environment.

On behalf of our members around the state, we submit this testimony in support of H.B. 6496, An Act Concerning Green Cleaning in schools. The Connecticut Coalition for Environmental

Justice works on this issue because some widely used cleaning products have adverse effects on janitors, building occupants and the environment including air and water quality. Asthma is a particular concern for our organization because rates are extremely high in Connecticut's urban centers, and toxic cleaning chemicals can both trigger asthma attacks and sensitize individuals who might not otherwise develop the disease.

For instance, cleaning chemicals have been associated with 11.6 percent of work-related asthma.

Cleaning products can also harm our natural environment. As an environmental justice organization, Connecticut Coalition for Environmental Justice is particularly concerned that chemicals in cleaning products contribute to the toxic waste stream when they're disposed of. Communities of color and low-income communities bear a disproportionate share of the adverse impacts of pollution and suffer from increased health hazards compared to the society as a whole.

The concentrated siting of waste-burning facilities in urban centers contributes to the disparities. We are particularly concerned about the burning of waste that contains chlorinated compounds which formed when bleach, a toxic cleaning chemical, interacts with organical chemicals.

Connecticut's urban centers are home to a large number of waste burning facilities including sewage sludge incinerators. Dioxins have been detected in the emissions from these types of incinerators. Green cleaning would reduce the toxicity of our waste and, hence, would reduce the toxic emissions from waste

burning facilities.

Cleaning products are responsible for approximately 8 percent of volatile organic compounds emissions not from vehicles. These compounds contribute to smog formation and can trigger asthma and other respiratory problems.

Green cleaning is an issue on which all three chapters of Connecticut Coalition for Environmental Justice -- Hartford, New Haven and Bridgeport -- are focused. In 2008, Environmental Justice coordinated efforts to pass municipal resolutions on green cleaning in a number of municipalities. Hartford schools and municipal buildings are shifting to green cleaning as a result of this effort, and New Haven and other urban communities are following Hartford's lead.

Now that cost-effective, safer green cleaning products are available for cleaning, we believe that all Connecticut schools should make the transition.

Thank you.

SENATOR GAFFEY: Thank you very much. Do you have any questions? Jim, is Susan Delaney still here? She will be next.

JAMES C. AGOSTINE: Thank you, Senator Gaffey, and thank you, members of the Committee for being here this evening, and I'm asking you to consider House Bill 6495, which is An Act Concerning Participation of Towns in interdistrict and charter schools.

Although this bill has ramifications for many towns across the state, I'm here tonight speaking specifically to the issues that it has caused, or the lack of this bill has

New Haven Public Schools (21)

Dr. Reginald Mayo
Superintendent
Administrative Offices
Gateway Center
54 Meadow Street 8th floor
New Haven, CT
203-946-8888

February 23, 2009

TESTIMONY BEFORE THE EDUCATION COMMITTEE ON VARIOUS BILLS

Senator Gaffey, Rep. Fleischmann, Members of the Education Committee, my name is Susan Weisselberg, speaking on behalf of New Haven Superintendent of Schools Dr. Reginald Mayo concerning a number of bills before you today.

In brief, we support Senate Bill No. 945, AAC World Language Requirements, Senate Bill No. 947, AAC High School Credit for Approved Online Coursework, House Bill No. 6487, AAC the Reporting of Truancy Data, House Bill No. 6488, AAC Installation of Photovoltaic Panels on School Buildings, House Bill No. 6492, AA Authorizing Board of Education Contingency Funds, House Bill No. 6495, AAC Participation of Towns in Charter Schools and Interdistrict Magnet Schools.

We oppose House Bill No. 6489, AAC School Arrest Reporting, and House Bill No. 6494, AAC Teen Dating Violence Education.

We have concerns about Senate Bill No. 942, AA Establishing a Date Certain for Student Notification of Attendance at an Interdistrict Magnet School, SB 943, AA Establishing a Uniform State Date for Connecticut Schools, Senate Bill No. 946, AAC Interdistrict Magnet Schools, House Bill No. 6496, AAC Green Cleaning Products in Schools, and House Bill No. 6497, AAC Educational Stability for Children in Foster Care.

Of the bills we support:

- **Senate Bill No. 945,** AAC World Language Requirements, reflects what we already require in New Haven for high school graduation. Attached is a supporting letter from our supervisor of world languages.
- **House Bill No. 6495,** AAC Participation of Towns in Charter Schools and Interdistrict Magnet Schools, allows students from within 20 miles to participate in charter schools and interdistrict magnet schools where there are openings. We support this so long as additional funds are budgeted for transportation of the students, to either type of school.

Of the bills we oppose:

- **House Bill No. 6489,** AAC School Arrest Reporting, requires an extensive data collection system that is far too

broad It will be expensive and burdensome to the school districts at a time when we are struggling with resources and unfunded mandates.

- **House Bill No. 6494**, AAC Teen Dating Violence Education, is another curriculum mandate when so many exist already. We work to address this important issue through our social development curriculum but ask that it not be another mandate without funding.

Of the bills where we have concerns:

- **Senate Bill No. 942**, AA Establishing a Date Certain for Student Notification of Attendance at an Interdistrict Magnet School, is fine as far as it goes but it needs to leave room for later notification when a student is accepted off a waiting list.
- **Senate Bill No. 943**, AA Establishing a Uniform State Date for Connecticut Schools, sets forth an admirable goal for school years to start after Labor Day. However, when Labor Day runs late, as it does this coming September, school would not start until September 9th. This kind of start date can push a school year out quite far in June, especially when a school district has December, February and April vacations. It also reduces the margin of error for snow days.
- In New Haven, we pride ourselves on our energy efficient and green buildings. **House Bill No. 6496**, AAC Green Cleaning Products in Schools, may well be achievable in the time frames specified; our experience with green cleaning products several years ago was less positive but we believe that green products have advanced significantly. We would hope that there is no cost differential by the time the mandate would take effect. We have some questions about the third party certification in Section 1(c) as opposed to a local health department. Also, we would request that posting indoor air quality reviews on each school's individual website, as required in Sec. 2, be revised to the Board of Education's website, as we have over 50 schools and want to make sure current information is readily available, and that the posting requirement be effective July 1, 2010 to give us time to post comprehensively.
- **House Bill No. 6497**, AAC Educational Stability for Children in Foster Care, codifies our existing practice in New Haven pursuant to federal law provisions. Please note that the transportation of children from foster care to school is quite expensive. The data gathering in the bill is helpful but what is critical is for DCF to attempt to place foster children relatively close to their home school. Currently we are providing additional transportation to 10 towns for New Haven students who have been placed outside of the district by DCF. The towns include: Waterbury, Meriden, Windsor, Torrington, Middletown, Stratford, Hebron, Windsor, Woodbridge and South Windsor. Some examples of cost: Windsor to a New Haven school, $276 daily, Waterbury to a New Haven school, $245 daily. The current transportation total for the 10 towns is $2,196 per day. If we were to calculate for the full year at 180 days the cost would be $395,280 annually. While many of the placements are not for the full year, as some cancel, there are always other placements added. There are

JOINT
STANDING
COMMITTEE
HEARINGS

EDUCATION
PART 2
321 – 626

2009

35

Connecticut Chapter
645 Farmington Ave.
Hartford, Connecticut 06105
www.connecticut.sierraclub.org

Education Committee
February 23, 2009
Testimony of Martin Mador
In Support of
HB6496 An Act Concerning Green Cleaning Products in Schools

I am Martin Mador, 130 Highland Ave., Hamden, CT 06518. I am the Legislative and Political Chair of the Connecticut Sierra Club, and am here today representing our 10,000 Connecticut members concerned about the health of our environment, our economic prosperity, and our quality of life. I am also the Legislative Co-Chair of the Connecticut Foundation for Environmentally Safe Schools (ConnFESS). I possess a Master's of Environmental Management degree from Yale. I am LEED accredited by the US Green Building Council.

Sierra considers the intentional introduction of toxins into our lives an important environmental issue, and is pleased to be, in partnership with ConnFESS, the principal proponent of this legislation. Addressing this issue in state level legislation is both appropriate and necessary.

I have testified before the General Assembly on green and healthy school issues every year since 2002. Starting with PA 03-220, An Act Concerning Indoor Air Quality in Schools, and continuing with PA 07-242, which requires green school construction, Connecticut has gradually instituted requirements to provide healthy, safe, and productive environments for our children and school staff. Children spend one third of their early lives in school buildings which have four times the occupant density of commercial offices. Their growing bodies are far more susceptible to toxins and contaminants than adults. Protecting the health of our students and thereby enabling them to excel academically, must be one of our highest priorities.

HB 6496 continues this focus on healthy schools by addressing a key issue of school operation and maintenance. Many traditionally used cleaning products have been shown to have health implications. They are asthma triggers, endocrine disrupters, producers of toxics gases when mixed, and causitive agents for rashes and headaches. Long term exposures are implicated in cancer, reproductive disorders, and organ failure.

The Collaborative for High Performance Schools (CHPS), perhaps the most knowledgable organization on green schools, says in their Maintenance and Operations Manual:

> *Dollar for dollar the single best investment a school can make with their maintenance budget is to adopt and implement a well-run green cleaning program.*

The bill requires only products with third party certification be approved for use. This is an important safeguard which assures that products not certified as safe will not be used. Because Green Seal, the prime certifying organization, requires that vendors provide no-cost training to ensure proper use of the product to receive their certification, school districts are assured they will receive this training without cost.

Over the past decade, manufacturers have identified alternatives which are equally effective, have no toxic effects, and can be acquired at no increased cost. The science of green buildings has taught us that, in addition to hard costs, consideration of the effects on building occupants are critically important in conducting an economic evaluation. Cleaning products which keep students healthier, enhance academics, raise attendance, and keep teachers and staff on the job have enormous cost benefits which must be included in the analysis.

The experience of many districts across the country have shown that green cleaning products have cost benefits. Some districts in Connecticut, such as Region 10 and the Branford schools, are purchasing now with no cost increases. Many published case studies have confirmed the savings. To choose one: Palm Beach County District (Florida) projects annual savings of $360,000 across the district.

Schools are already authorized to purchase through DAS. This bill extends that relationship by having DAS designate the products and standards. As DAS has been doing this for almost two years for state office buildings pursuant to PA 07-100, the agency has already accumulated the necessary expertise. Cleaning a school is no different from an office building. Statewide purchasing in bulk through DAS will result in significant savings.

New York state, which requires green-clean, has produced an operations and procedures manual which is readily adaptable by DAS to Connecticut, thus minimizing the effort the agency will need to invest in meeting the requirements of the bill.

29

Testimony in Support of: HB 6496, An Act Concerning Green Cleaning in Schools

Good afternoon Senator Gaffey, Representative Fleischmann, Representative Lesser, and members of the Education Committee. Thank you for the opportunity to meet with you and provide testimony on this important initiative, Bill 6496 An Act Concerning Green Cleaning in Schools. My name is Nancy Simcox. I am a research industrial hygienist at the University of Connecticut Health Center. My area of expertise is occupational and environmental health. I serve on the Connecticut School Indoor Environment Resource Team (CSIERT), and on the Board of the Connecticut Council of Occupational Safety and Health. I strongly support this bill as an approach that encourages and promotes the use of safer alternatives to toxic chemicals. A green cleaning program can reduce chemical exposures and provide important benefits to the health of our children, teachers staff, custodians. The program also protects the environment. My experience in working with school facility directors and custodians show that they are ready to embrace green cleaning in their schools, and are ready to be leaders of the green economy with these new green jobs. Connecticut can serve as a model for other states by passing this important bill.

I have worked with the National Collaborative Work Group on Green Cleaning and Policy Reform in Schools to bring their Cleaning for Health Schools Toolkit to Connecticut. By working through CSIERT and the Tools for Schools Program at the CT Department of Public Health, we have developed a modified Cleaning for Health Program that works for Connecticut school communities. Many schools have successfully implemented a green cleaning for health program in their communities. This bill is necessary to ensure that all Connecticut children, teachers/staff, and custodians in our school communities benefit from a green cleaning for health program.

The Cleaning for Health program was developed to reduce asthma triggers and other health effects from institutional cleaning. Ingredients in common cleaning products have been directly linked to asthma, with custodians experiencing one of the highest rates of occupational asthma. Studies show that 6 out of 100 janitors using traditional cleaning products experience chemical related injuries, including burns to eyes and skin. Other health problems linked to cleaning chemicals include chronic respiratory illnesses.

The CSIERT Cleaning for Health Program is an educational and technical assistance program designed to help schools transition to the new generation of less-toxic cleaning chemicals and to adopt state-of-the-art cleaning practices. It focuses on three key concepts: 1)less-toxic cleaning products that are certified by a third-party as environmentally preferable, 2)high filtration cleaning equipment, and 3) best practices. Technical assistance begins with a Cleaning Products and Practices Evaluation. The Evaluation is conducted by trained industrial hygienists from the University of Connecticut Health Center, Yale University and other organizations. At the end of the evaluation, the school is provided a checklist with resources and cost-effective recommendations to improve the school's cleaning practices and products in cost-effective ways.

I have worked with school facility directors across the state of Connecticut to promote the program. During my evaluations, I have been told by facility directors how the transition to going green has saved the school money, and how helpful custodians have found our training sessions. We have found that the model works effectively through the CT Tools for Schools Program because we can focus on the needs of each school district, and the evaluations include head custodians from each school. By working together on green cleaning with our school districts, local health departments, building and grounds school associations, and unions, we are improving the health of our school communities and protecting our environment. I look forward to the passage of this bill and continuing our work with school communities in Connecticut to implement a Cleaning for Health Program in their school district.

Nancy Simcox, MS
Research Industrial Hygienist
University of Connecticut Health Center
Division of Public Health and Population Sciences
Section of Occupational and Environmental Health
270 Farmington Avenue- Suite 262
Farmington, CT 06032-6210

25

Written Testimony of Diane L. Ethier
Acting President and Legislative Co-Chair, Connecticut Foundation for Environmentally Safe Schools (ConnFESS)
National Education Association's representative to the School Subcommittee of the National Institutes of Health's National Asthma Education and Prevention Program

Before the Connecticut General Assembly Education Committee, February 23, 2009

Testimony in support of Raised House Bill No. 6496: An Act Concerning Green Cleaning Products in Schools

Senator Gaffey, Representative Fleischmann and members of the Education Committee:

My name is Diane Ethier and I represent the CT Foundation for Environmentally Safe Schools (ConnFESS). I am testifying in strong support of Raised Bill No. 6496: AAC Green Cleaning Products in Schools. The primary focus of ConnFESS has always been and will continue to be educating the public on school environmental health issues. We have two main messages: 1) Indoor environmental quality (IEQ) issues can dramatically impact the long-term health of school occupants and the quality of education that students receive and 2) Healthier indoor environments in schools will lead to improved health for students and staff and ultimately lead to improved attendance, performance and productivity. The use of Green Cleaning products and practices reduces exposures to toxic chemicals and is a critical step in cleaning up indoor environments in schools.

I am a retired high school mathematics teacher. Since my retirement in 2003, I have been educating school stakeholders to identify and resolve indoor air quality (IAQ) problems and reduce asthma triggers in schools. I am an IAQ mentor and presenter for the National Education Association Health Information Network (NEAHIN) and NEA's representative to the School Subcommittee of the National Institutes of Health's National Asthma Education and Prevention Program (NAEPP). Asthma is the leading cause of student absenteeism and a leading occupational disease of teachers and custodians—*that is, they get it on the job*. Schools with healthier indoor air report fewer asthma attacks, fewer incidents of bronchitis and upper respiratory illnesses, better attendance and fewer visits to the school nurse. The NAEPP School Subcommittee develops resources for school personnel on how to create an "Asthma-Friendly School," a school that:

1. Adopts and enforces a tobacco-free policy that prohibits tobacco use at all times, on all school property, by all people and for all school activities
2. Uses integrated pest management techniques to control pests
3. **Uses the least toxic products available**
4. **Develops an IAQ management plan for preventing or reducing IAQ problems and allergens or irritants that make asthma worse:** tobacco smoke, chalk dust, dust mites, mold, mildew, cockroaches and other pests, insect and pet dander, **strong odors or fumes from such products as pesticides, paint, perfumes and cleaning chemicals, scented products, and dust and debris from clutter, construction/renovation**
5. **Uses good housekeeping and maintenance practices**
6. Reduces students' exposure to diesel bus exhaust at all times

I am the ConnFESS representative to the CT School Indoor Environment Resource Team (CSIERT or Resource Team). Other CSIERT member organizations that are actively supporting HB 6496 include the American Lung Association of CT, the Connecticut Education Association, the CT Federation of School Administrators and the CT Parent Teacher Association. The Resource Team provides free training to school districts across the state on both the EPA's IAQ Tools for Schools program and the CSIERT Cleaning for Health Program. The Resource Team helps school-based teams to identify and make plans to remediate environmental health hazards in their schools. **Regardless of the size or wealth of the school districts being trained, four main messages always need to be delivered about improving school IEQ: keep moisture out, keep ventilation systems working as designed, keep buildings clean and reduce exposures to chemical and biological pollutants.**

Many school indoor air quality complaints arise from inadequate housekeeping that fails to remove dirt and dust. School maintenance is routinely underfunded, understaffed and the first to be cut during tough economic times. Schools should be cleaned frequently, thoroughly and effectively and cleaning products and practices are a necessary part of this process. However, the industrial strength cleaning products and room deodorizers that some schools use actually add to indoor air pollution. These products can produce odors and emit a variety of chemicals that are hazardous to the environment and to the health of maintenance workers, students and staff. Conventional cleaning products may contain toxic ingredients that can not only cause rashes, headaches, nausea and dizziness, but can also lead to long-term health problems such as asthma, cancer and lung disease. Many are known to affect the respiratory system, central nervous system, reproduction, development, kidney and liver. Under the US Worker Right to Know Law, school districts are required to provide custodians access to the MSDS sheets of all products they may be exposed to when working. School districts are also required to ensure that all cleaning and maintenance products are properly labeled, that special training for all employees who might be exposed to hazardous products is provided, and that a hazardous response plan is in place for dealing with chemical spills and accidents.

Green Cleaning reduces environmental and health risks by selecting alternative, third-party certified products, by applying these products properly, and by implementing maintenance practices that minimize exposure to cleaning products. Training of school staff is essential to ensure the effectiveness of a school green cleaning program and ConnFESS is pleased to see that ongoing training is a requirement in HB 6496. Custodians need to know how to properly apply, mix, dilute and dispose of these new products and school districts need assistance to transition to effective green cleaning as a part of their indoor air quality (IAQ) programs (CT has required school IAQ programs since 2003). Free Green Cleaning training is currently available from three sources: vendors of Green Seal products, the Cleaning for Health program offered by the CT Department of Public Health (DPH) through the Resource Team and the Cleaning for Healthy Schools Toolkit available online (www.cleaningforhealthyschools.org).

ConnFESS is also pleased to see that so many of HB 6496's proposals parallel or strengthen existing language in other CT state laws dealing with school IAQ, pesticide usage in schools and green cleaning products in state-owned buildings. We were promised when AAC Indoor Air Quality in Schools passed in 2003 that it was just the first step in providing safe and healthy environments for all school occupants. ConnFESS sees HB 6496 as an important second step in the process.

School districts are currently required by An Act Concerning Indoor Air Quality in Schools (CGS Sections 10-220 (a) and (d)) to adopt and implement an IAQ program, to report semiannually on actions taken to implement an IAQ program and/or conduct five year inspections/evaluations at some school facilities. The addition of a required Green Cleaning program to the statutes, along with an updated reporting and inspection process, strengthens existing IAQ programs. Amending the current CT SDE School Facility Survey (ED050) to include questions that assess how green cleaning has been incorporated into school indoor air quality programs provides ongoing documentation needed to ensure some level of compliance. On-line posting of completed ED050 surveys and five year inspection results requires minimal staff time and makes information more readily accessible, in a timely manner, to members of the school community (i.e. Right to Know).

At the beginning of each school year (and during the school year for transfer students and new hires), CT law (CGS Section 10-231) requires local school boards to provide parents, guardians and staff with a written policy on pesticide applications or integrated pest management programs. HB 6496 extends this annual notification to include the school district's Green Cleaning policy, but fails to require notification of staff or new hires and transfer students throughout the school year, which ConnFESS would like to see added. By requiring the adoption, online posting and dissemination of a written policy statement, this proposed law ensures the continuity of green cleaning practices, regardless of changes of district management or administration. The statement "No parent, guardian, teacher or staff member may bring into the school facility any consumer product which is intended to clean, deodorize, sanitize or disinfect." is an essential part of the notification process. Products brought into school that are not certified by an independent third party are a significant barrier to implementing an effective school green cleaning policy and a threat to the health and safety of school occupants.

All CT school children and employees need to be guaranteed a safe school environment, free of preventable health hazards. ConnFESS is very encouraged to see that Raised HB No. 6496 addresses one of the most significant ways to improve IAQ in schools, reducing exposures to chemical pollutants. I thank the co-chairs and the members of the Education Committee for focusing in on this important issue and for this opportunity to testify.

Diane Ethier
19 Cooney Road
Pomfret Center, CT 06259

CT Foundation for Environmentally Safe Schools
A nonprofit organization dedicated to promoting policies, practices and resources that protect school occupants from environmental health hazards
www.pollutionfreeschools.org
888-420-5526

Green Clean for Schools Campaign - Frequently Asked Questions

What is green cleaning?

There is no legal definition for "green cleaning" and no restriction on the use of the term by manufacturers. The CT Foundation for Environmentally Safe Schools (ConnFESS) defines green cleaning as a 21st century approach to facility maintenance that uses cost-effective cleaning products and practices that protect human health and the environment. Cleaning products containing the least toxic compounds are utilized in combination with advanced technology and equipment that provide superior methods for removing dirt, soil and particulates found in indoor environments.

What kind of green clean policy has been established in Connecticut?

Our state government has already adopted and is now implementing a green clean policy for state buildings. As a result of Executive Order #14 issued by Governor Rell in 2006 and passage of PA 07-100: An Act Concerning the Use of Cleaning Products in State Buildings in 2007, the CT Department of Administrative Services with assistance from the CT Department of Environmental Protection has established green cleaning policies and procedures for state-owned buildings. CT State Vocational Technical Schools must comply with this law since they are state buildings, but all other elementary and secondary schools are not included. Environmentally preferable products must be procured and used for cleaning. Cleaning products regulated by FIFRA (the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide and Rodenticide Act) such as disinfectants, disinfecting cleansers, sanitizers and antimicrobials or products for which no guidelines or environmental standards have been established are specifically excluded from this requirement.

What fiscal impact would the implementation of the proposed school green cleaning law have on local school districts?

The key components for school green clean legislation proposed by the CT Foundation for Environmentally Safe Schools (ConnFESS) in 2009 include requirements that have been proven to save money or to be cost neutral. Requirements include the implementation of cost-effective best practices for green cleaning in schools (see fact sheet) as well as the phase in of environmentally preferable cleaning products certified by an independent third party such as Green Seal, Inc. and EcoLogo. Training in green cleaning for schools is available at no cost from a variety of sources. The transition to these environmentally preferable products will be assisted by the expertise already developed by the CT Department of Administrative Services pursuant to PA 07-100 as well as the purchasing power of the state to reduce costs for local school districts pursuant to PA 08-0002. Given the economic prognosis for the 2009 legislative session, unfunded mandates that would have required school districts to purchase advanced technology and equipment such as HEPA vacuums or high filtration floor buffer systems used in the most effective school green cleaning programs were not included in this proposed legislation.

What is an environmentally preferable product?

When defined by the federal government (Executive Order 13101), environmentally preferable products "means products or services that have a lesser or reduced effect on human health and the environment when compared with competing products or services that serve the same purpose. This comparison may consider raw materials acquisition, production, manufacturing, packaging, distribution, reuse, operation, maintenance or disposal of the product or service."

Why is third-party certification of environmentally preferable products essential?

Many manufactures and retailers are using terms such as "environmentally safe", "green" or "non-toxic" to boost sales. Some of these claims may be true, but many are not. In order to ensure the health and safety of school children and employees as well as the effectiveness of these products, certification from third-party organizations such as Green Seal and EcoLogo is a must. Both of these third-party organizations have certified a vast array of high performing maintenance products suitable for use in school facilities.

What criteria should third-party certifying organizations meet?

In order to ensure the integrity of a third-party organization it must:

- Have an open, transparent process for setting standards that involves the public and key stakeholders;
- Clearly define the fees a manufacturer must pay for certification;
- Clearly identify any potential conflicts of interest;
- Have criteria for certification be publicly available and transparent;
- Base certification on consideration of human health and safety, ecological toxicity, other environmental impacts, and resource conservation, as appropriate, for the product and its packaging, on a life cycle basis;
- Require periodic revisions and updates of the standards;
- Monitor and enforce the standards, provide for the authority to inspect the manufacturing facilities, and periodically do so;
- Have a registered/legally protected certification mark;
- Make the standards easily accessible to purchasers and manufacturers (e.g. available for download on the program's website);
- Be developed by consensus, if possible;
- Establish leadership levels in standards for products.

How is the US Environmental Protection Agency's Design for the Environment or DfE different from Green Seal?

Design for the Environment (DfE) does not meet the criteria for third-party certification. The DfE team reviews ingredients in products for potential health and environmental issues and recommends safer alternatives for toxic chemicals. They do not verify what ends up in the product and do not inspect the manufacturer's facility. In order to use the DfE logo, manufacturers simply sign a pledge stating they will use safer ingredients.

How is the GS-37 Green Seal, Inc. standard for general purpose cleaners helpful to school facilities managers?

GS-37 is a standard developed and periodically updated by Green Seal, Inc. that identifies general purpose cleaners, restroom, glass and carpet cleaners that are "environmentally preferable". Cleaners covered by GS-37 are intended for routine use by institutions, warehouses and industrial facilities as well as schools, day-care centers and nursing homes. GS-37 does not apply to air fresheners, disinfectants or sanitizers.

The GS-37 standard enables school facilities managers to readily find and use safer alternatives to toxic cleaning chemicals without becoming an expert in the chemical analysis of cleaning chemicals. *Vendors of GS-37 products are required to provide free training to customers on the proper use of their cleaners.*

How does the recent fourth edition of the GS-37 standard provide better protection for school children and employees?

The newly adopted standard (August 2008) is more protective of vulnerable populations such as children, women of childbearing age, women who are pregnant or breastfeeding and immunocompromised individuals. Specific asthmagens (Diethanolamine and Triethanolamine) that cause asthma and phthalates will be eliminated from GS-37 cleaning products. The new standard also tightens restrictions for volatile organic compounds and pH levels while continuing to prohibit carcinogens.

What is the Cleaning for Health program?

The CT School Indoor Environment Resource Team is now offering a green cleaning program entitled Cleaning for Health. This program was developed to reduce asthma triggers and other adverse health effects from industrial cleaning. Cleaning for Health is an educational and technical assistance program designed to help schools transition to a new generation of less toxic cleaning chemicals and to adopt state-of-the-art cleaning practices. It focuses on three key concepts:

1. less toxic cleaning products certified by a third party as environmentally preferable
2. high filtration cleaning equipment
3. best practices

For further information, contact Kenny Foscue at 860-509-7740 at the CT Dept. of Public Health.

What is the Cleaning for Healthy Schools program?

This is an online toolkit that was developed by the National Collaborative Work Group on Green Cleaning and Chemical Policy Reform in Schools. Members of this work group include Healthy Schools Network, American Lung Association of New England, The Green Schools Initiative, National Association of School Nurses, INFORM and MassCOSH. The Toolkit has easy-to-use learning modules designed to introduce all audiences to the concept of green clean and Cleaning for Healthy Schools. The Cleaning for Healthy Schools Toolkit (www.cleaningforhealthyschools.org) is an open-source, industry-free, customizable, comprehensive program to safeguard human health, reduce exposure to chemicals and cost-effectively improve the performance of cleaning programs.

(47) F

CONNECTICUT CONFERENCE OF MUNICIPALITIES

900 Chapel St., 9th Floor, New Haven, Connecticut 06510-2807
Phone (203) 498-3000 • Fax (203) 562-6314 • www.ccm-ct.org

THE VOICE OF LOCAL GOVERNMENT

TESTIMONY

of the

CONNECTICUT CONFERENCE OF MUNICIPALITIES

to the

EDUCATION COMMITTEE

February 23, 2009

CCM is Connecticut's statewide association of towns and cities and the voice of local governments - your partners in governing Connecticut. Our members represent over 93% of Connecticut's population. We appreciate this opportunity to provide testimony to you on issues of concern to towns and cities.

CCM opposes Raised House Bill 6496 *"An Act Concerning Green Cleaning Products"* as a new unfunded mandate on local governments.

Certainly the intention of this proposal, to utilize only "green" cleaning products in schools, is laudable. But this bill would be an **unfunded mandate to local and regional school districts by requiring**:

- The ***implementation of a "green cleaning program"*** in all school districts for the cleaning and maintenance of all school buildings and facilities by October 1, 2011.
- The ***use of only cleaning products that have met the "green" standards*** of a certified independent third party.
- ***Training and refresher courses*** for all facility managers, custodians and indoor air quality committees.
- Local boards of education to ***provide notice*** of the green building program to all parents ***via mail and posting on each individual schools website.***

As any shopper knows, the cost of "green" products often is more expensive than traditional products. When purchasing such products for a residence or business, the individual who chooses to purchase the "green" brands does so of their own accord and has made a conscious decision to spend the extra money. While the costs of such products have come down over the last several years as demand has increased, the reality is that they still tend to be more expensive.

Instead of creating yet another unfunded state mandate on local school districts, on top of the plethora that are already in place, CCM urges the committee to (1) establish a voluntary program that would allow municipalities to procure "green" products through the Department of Administrative Services; (2) establish a list of vendors who provide these products and distribute it to local purchasing agents; and, (3) create an educational program to share with local school districts on the benefits and proper use of these products.

However, in the end **the decision should be left to the discretion of the local purchasing agents** to determine the best product for their circumstances – unless amended as suggested, we urge you to **take no action** on this bill.

##

If you have any questions, please contact Kachina Walsh-Weaver, Senior Legislative Associate of
via email kweaver@ccm-ct.org or via phone (203) 498-3026.

43

Association of School Nurses of Connecticut
Connecticut Nurses' Association
377 Research Parkway, Suite 2-D
Meriden, CT 06450-7160
203-238-1207

TESTIMONY RE: H. B. No. 6496 (RAISED) AN ACT CONCERNING GREEN CLEANING PRODUCTS IN SCHOOLS.
Education Committee Hearing
February 23, 2009

Good afternoon Senator Gaffey, Representative Fleischmann and members of the Education Committee.

Thank-you for the opportunity to provide testimony on behalf of the Connecticut Nurses' Association (CNA), the professional organization for registered nurses in Connecticut and the Association of School Nurses of Connecticut, the professional association for school nurses. I am Polly T. Barey, RN, MS, a member of the Connecticut Nurses' Association's Government Relations Committee. I speak in support of H.B. 6496, An Act Concerning Green Cleaning Products in Schools.

Through the 2006 Executive Order #14 issued by Governor Rell and passage of PA -100, An Act Concerning the Use of Cleaning Products in State Buildings in 2007, the CT Department of Administrative Services with assistance from the CT Department of Environmental Protection has established green cleaning policies and procedures for state-owned buildings. These important first steps were essential to H. B. 6496 which will extend the requirement to include schools to make them safer and healthier.

There are significant health issues making this requirement important:

- School buildings are densely occupied indoor spaces with four times as many occupants per square foot found in schools compared to office spaces. Children are the majority of the occupants. Their size, increased metabolic rates and developing organs make them much more vulnerable to exposures to toxic cleaning chemicals.
- The chemicals contained in conventional cleaners are of concern because their use exposes children, custodial staff, and other building occupants to these chemicals.

- These products may contain carcinogens, respiratory irritants and asthmagens, and ingredients that are toxic to the central nervous system, reproduction, developmental systems and kidneys and liver. They can also be irritants to the eyes, nose and throat as well as sensitive to skin.
- Diseases related to ingredients in conventional cleaning products include
  - Allergies and chemical sensitivities
  - Asthma
    - An average of one out of every 13 school-age children has asthma
    - Asthma is a leading cause of school absenteeism with 14.7 million school days missed each year (EPA – Managing Asthma in the School Environment)
    - A 2008 British study links cleaning chemicals used by mothers to increased asthma risk (attached)
    - Chronic respiratory illnesses
    - Janitorial workers experience one of the highest rates of occupational asthma (F. Reinisch, et al., "Physician Reports of Work-Related Asthma in California, 1993–1996," *American Journal of Industrial Medicine* 39)
- Hormone disrupting chemicals in cleaning products include alkylphenol ethoxylates – APEs and phthalates
  - Exposure may change how the endocrine systems work, resulting in:
    - Testicular cancer
    - Reproductive abnormalities
    - Lower sperm counts

Other considerations:

- The costs of lost work time, productivity, additional expenses for substitute teachers and potential liability issues from worker's compensation and disability claims.
- The fiscal impact - the key components for school green clean legislation proposed by the CT Foundation for Environmentally Safe Schools (ConnFESS) include requirements that have saved money or been cost neutral.

We urge committee members to support this bill which will require "green cleaning programs" and making a critical switch to independent, third party certified cleaning products that will decrease toxic chemical exposures in schools and make schools safer and healthier for students and workers.

Thank you.

Press Release

For Immediate release

Asthma risk in children linked to household chemicals used by their mums around the time of birth

Women who use a lot of household cleaning products when they are pregnant or shortly after the birth of their baby, may be increasing the risk of their child developing asthma, suggests research from the Children of the 90s study.

The findings, published in this month's issue of the European Respiratory Journal, indicate high exposure to household chemicals during pregnancy or soon after birth was linked to the child developing wheezing and asthma by the age of seven years.

Asthma is the commonest cause of chronic wheeze in children and, despite large increases in asthma prevalence in many industrialised countries, the causes for the rise in prevalence of asthma have not been fully identified.

Researchers monitored the use of use of household chemicals by pregnant women who were part of the University of Bristol-based study, Children of the 90s – also known as Avon Longitudinal Study of Parents and Children.

They found that children exposed to high levels of chemicals contained in products such as bleach, paint and air freshener had a 41% increased risk of wheezing persistently to the age of 7 ½ years and had slightly lower than normal lung function.

Researchers also carried out skin prick tests on around 7,000 of the children at age 7 which to test for allergies and found that exposure to chemicals had a stronger effect on those children with asthma but without allergies.

Dr John Henderson, lead author of the study and an expert in paediatric respiratory medicine at the University Of Bristol, said small children might be more likely to develop asthma in homes where more chemicals are used.

"We think that is perhaps due to irritant effects of the chemicals on the child after birth, which may cause inflammation of the airways leading to the development of asthma," he said.

He added, "The importance of this research is that it points to direct effects of chemical exposure on lung development or irritation of the airways after birth."

University of BRISTOL

Source: - *[Household chemical, persistent wheezing and lung function:effect modification by atopy? J Henderson, A Sherriff, A Farrow and J G Ayres – European Respiratory Journal, March 2008]*

END

Editors note:

- ALSPAC The Avon Longitudinal Study of Parents and Children (also known as Children of the 90s) is a unique ongoing research project based in the University of Bristol. It enrolled 14,000 mothers during pregnancy in 1991-2 and has followed most of the children and parents in minute detail ever since.
- The ALSPAC study could not have been undertaken without the continuing financial support of the Medical Research Council, the Wellcome Trust, and the University of Bristol among many others.

For further information contact ALSPAC PR and Communications Team:
Anne Gorringe or **Sally Watson** on tel: 0117 331 6729

See www.alspac.bristol.ac.uk

15

Testimony to support H.B. 6496 An Act Concerning Green Cleaning Products in Schools.
February 23, 2009

Senator Gaffey, Representative Fleischmann and other members of the Education Committee my name is Joellen Lawson and I am here to testify in strong support of H.B. 6496 An Act Concerning Green Cleaning Products in Schools. I am speaking to you today as the founder and Honorary President of the Connecticut Foundation for Environmentally Safe Schools (ConnFESS) as well as a board member for the Healthy Schools Network, Inc., a national 501c3 research, information, education and advocacy organization located in Albany, New York.

ConnFESS is a state based nonprofit grassroots organization dedicated to promoting policies, practices and resources that protect school occupants from preventable health hazards such as the fumes and residues from toxic cleaning chemicals. The Healthy Schools Network, Inc. coordinates the National Work Group for Green Cleaning and Chemical Policy Reform in Schools. This national work group includes the following other organizations:

- American Federation of Teachers
- American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees
- International Green Purchasing Institute
- Green Schools Initiative
- New York United Teachers
- INFORM
- National Association of School Nurses
- American Lung Association of Maine
- Massachusetts Committee on Occupational Safety and Health
- Massachusetts Healthy Schools

ConnFESS is also an active member of the Coalition for a Safe and Healthy Connecticut. The coalition has made the passage of effective and responsible school green clean legislation one of its top three priorities for the 2009 legislative session.

The consensus among the national and state advocacy groups we collaborate with is that successful green clean programs begin with two basic steps:

1.) The phase in of safer, affordable and effective cleaning products certified by an independent third-party.
2.) The implementation of best cleaning management practices.

Both of these steps can be achieved without additional spending and in some cases while saving money. However, implementing best practices has the greatest potential for saving money because 90% of most cleaning budgets is spent on labor costs and only 2-5% pays for the purchase of cleaning chemicals. Products that are not used effectively and efficiently waste time, chemicals and other resources like water and electricity.

Attached to my testimony are a series of fact sheets. One is titled: *Green Cleaning: Best Practices Protect Human Health, the Environment and the Taxpayers' Pocketbooks* which divides best practices into four key categories: those that 1) save money, 2) are cost neutral 3) have minimal costs or 4) pay for themselves overtime. This fact sheet is based primarily on the guidelines and specifications for the procurement and use of environmentally preferable cleaning products written for New York schools in 2006. These New York guidelines include a best management practices section (pgs 12-19) that could easily be adopted for Connecticut schools.

Another fact sheet called *Green Cleaning In Schools Is Cost Effective* provides examples of how school districts across the country have used environmentally preferable cleaning products combined with these best practices that resulted in cost savings and improved attendance.

Other fact sheets attached to my testimony include:

1) *Green Cleaning: Safer, Affordable and Effective*
2) *Cost and Consequences of Using Traditional Cleaning Chemicals*

Thankfully, this bill promotes both the use of safer alternative cleaning products and best practices. Overall, it is a very good bill that with a few minor changes has the potential to serve as a model bill for other states. (Please see last page of attachments for suggestions)

H.B. 6496 An Act Concerning Green Cleaning Products in Schools builds on the best parts of current green clean policy in Connecticut that was established in 2006 by Executive Order #14 and in 2007 by PA07-100. H.B. 6496 An Act Concerning Green Cleaning Products in Schools duplicates that policy's fundamental language that requires the procurement and use of environmentally preferable products (as defined by federal Executive Order 13101) and states that these products must be certified by an independent third-party. Such precisely defined language is critical because "green cleaning" has no legal definition and no limits on how manufacturers use or abuse it. Independent third-party certification ensures product claims about health, safety, cleaning effectiveness and environmental sustainability have been thoroughly verified and will continue to be verified on an ongoing basis.

H.B. 6496 An Act Concerning Green Cleaning Products in Schools also addresses the most obvious and significant limitation of current green clean policy – that it only applies to state owned buildings. Right now, all state workers employed in state buildings and the students and personnel who occupy the seventeen vocational-technical high schools in Connecticut are protected by a law designed to reduce and prevent exposure to toxic cleaning chemicals. Passage of H.B. 6496 An Act Concerning Green Cleaning Products in Schools would extend these safeguards to the students, staff, custodians and educators in all of Connecticut's other secondary and elementary schools. Some of our most vulnerable populations (young children and women who are of child bearing age, breastfeeding or pregnant) spend considerable amounts of time in our public schools. They deserve the strongest green clean policy possible.

Within Connecticut, important child advocates including the State Office of Child Advocate, Connecticut Parent Teacher Association (PTA) and the Connecticut Commission on Children

support passage of H.B. 6496. Jeanne Milstein will be submitting written testimony. Representatives from Connecticut PTA and the Connecticut Commission on Children asked that I include statements of their support in my testimony.

- Marne Usher of Connecticut PTA has stated, "Connecticut PTA supports H.B. 6496 as a common sense and cost-effective way to safeguard the health of students and their teachers."
- Liz Brown of the Connecticut Commission on Children wrote, "Phasing in safer alternatives to hazardous cleaning chemicals will help keep students healthy and ready to learn. There are a growing number of children with asthma and allergies who especially need this protection against toxic cleaning chemicals."

As we advocate for Connecticut's school children, it is essential to acknowledge that in some cases unsafe and unhealthy environmental health conditions in schools have actually denied children their basic right to a free and appropriate education and left them to cope with serious building-related illnesses for the rest of their lives. Such situations were documented for the public record when students testified in favor of An Act Concerning Indoor Air Quality in Schools. Since passage of that act in 2003, all Connecticut schools have been required to adopt and implement an indoor air quality program.

Passage of H.B. 6496 would require green cleaning to be incorporated into these school indoor air quality programs. This process would encourage a sense of shared responsibility throughout the school community for making sure a school is a greener, cleaner and healthier place to learn and work.

We thank the co-chairs and members of the Education Committee for their leadership and vision with regard to this important school environmental health issue. The language of this bill demonstrates a clear understanding of the health risks posed by toxic cleaning chemicals as well as the solutions needed to minimize those risks that are summarized in our fact sheet: *Why Are We So Keen on Green Legislation for Schools?* (see attached)

We applaud your awareness of the green clean movement as the emerging standard for cleaning in the 21st century rather than as a passing fad. By raising this bill you have provided us all with a rare and unique opportunity to establish policy that is simultaneously:
1.) Fiscally responsible
2.) Preserves the environment
3.) Protects human health
4.) Defends the basic right of all Connecticut students to learn in a school free of preventable health hazards.

Thank you for this opportunity to testify.

Joellen Lawson
46 The Blvd.
Newtown, CT 06470

Why Are We So Keen On Green Clean Legislation for Schools?

Green cleaning uses effective cleaning practices that have minimal impacts on human health and the environment. In Connecticut, environmentally preferable products certified by an independent third-party organization (such as Green Seal or EcoLogo) must be procured and used in state owned buildings. CT State Vocational Technical Schools must comply with this law, but all other elementary and secondary schools are not included.

WHY IS THIS A PROBLEM?

- The US EPA has consistently ranked indoor pollution among the top five environmental risks to public health.
- Toxic cleaning products can significantly contribute to indoor air pollution in schools.
- Children's size, increased metabolic rates and developing organ systems make them much more vulnerable to exposures to toxic cleaning chemicals.
- Recent studies link cleaning chemicals to elevated asthma rates among teachers, teachers' aides and school custodians.
- NIOSH attributes 12% of occupational asthma cases to exposure to cleaning chemicals.
- Some Connecticut schools continue to use toxic cleaning chemicals even as safer, effective and affordable alternatives are readily available.
- Other CT school districts who claim to be using "green cleaning" are not using products certified by an independent third-party and have not been using best cleaning practices advocated by experts and scientific research.

WHAT IS THE SOLUTION?

All CT public schools have been required to adopt and implement an indoor air quality program since 2003. Legislation that would require incorporating a green clean program into an indoor air quality committee's management plan will make schools greener, cleaner and healthier places to learn and work. To be effective, this Green Cleaning program must require that:

- Schools procure and use environmentally preferable products certified by an independent third-party organization (such as Green Seal or EcoLogo). These are the products currently required for state owned buildings.
- School facilities managers and cleaning personnel be trained or retrained in proper product application, mixing, dilution and disposal. Free training is currently available.
- Schools report on actions taken to adopt and implement their Green Clean program when they report on the status of their indoor air quality program
- Schools annually notify parents, guardians and staff with a written Green Cleaning Policy at the same time that they notify in writing about the pesticide usage policy.

Help us to make CT the next state after New York and Illinois to pass legislation that requires elementary and secondary schools to use safer, more effective cleaning products and procedures in place of harmful, toxic chemicals and inefficient, costly methods.

The CT Foundation for Environmentally Safe Schools 888-420-5536 www.pollutionfreeschools.org
Endorsed by the Coalition for a Safe and Healthy Connecticut www.safehealthyct.org

Green Clean Best Practices
Protect Human Health, the Environment and Taxpayers' Pocketbooks

Dollar for dollar the single best investment a school can make with their maintenance budget is to adopt and implement a well-run green cleaning program.
(Collaborative for High Performance Schools' Maintenance and Operations Manual)

A well-run green cleaning for schools program makes the cleaning process more effective, efficient, safer and more financially and environmentally responsible.

Best practices that save money include:

1. Consolidating the overall number of cleaning products to a few effective, third-party independently certified environmentally preferable products.

2. Using one concentrated cleaner that is diluted for the following tasks:
   - bathroom/restroom cleaner
   - all purpose cleaner
   - carpet spotter/extraction cleaner
   - glass/window cleaner
   - neutral floor cleaner

3. Ordering concentrated environmentally safe products that are sold with reduced packaging for products and shipping containers frees up custodial closet space, saves on overall shipping charges and creates less waste for landfills.

4. Eliminating the use of aerosol cleaning products. Ounce for ounce aerosol cleaning products are more expensive than other equally effective cleaning solutions. Aerosols emit harmful fumes.

5. Using Green Seal certified products because they are specially designed to work with cold rather than hot water which saves on energy costs.

Best practices that are cost-neutral include:

1. Switching to environmentally preferable cleaning products certified by a third, independent party.

2. Using third-party certified handsoaps, not antibacterial foaming handsoaps.

3. Following instructions and precautions provided by the manufacturer. For example:
   A) Using more product than recommended can result in damage to the surface being cleaned and produce residue. Cleaning products should not leave

residue that would require a fresh water rinse because that wastes time and water resources. Even more critical is that residues of cleaning chemicals on surfaces with which young children come into contact can result in a harmful exposure.

B) Do not mix products.

4. Restrict use of disinfectants to pre-determined high risk areas. Disinfectants are registered pesticides and should never be used for sanitizing or general cleaning purposes. They should only be used as directed by the Department of Public Health and Centers for Disease Control.

5. It is important to clean first and then use a disinfectant or germicide only if needed. Surfaces must be thoroughly cleaned first.

6. Disinfectants should be allowed to remain on a surface for the required dwell time, which is usually about 10 minutes.

7. Scheduling floor stripping and finishing and heavy duty carpet cleaning when school facilities are vacant. Custodial staff should wear recommended protective gear and proceed with caution. The school building should be well ventilated and aired out during summer vacations or extended holidays when these highly toxic chemicals are used.

8. Vacuuming carpets regularly and thoroughly (5-7 passes of a carpet brush over each section) helps to maintain the life of the carpet and indoor environmental quality. It can reduce the need to use chemicals or water-based shampoo extraction products because regularly vacuumed carpets contain significantly less dirt, dust or food residue.

9. Maintaining vacuum cleaners and filters. A vacuum will not clean well if the filter is clogged or the bag is full. If the filter or bag are not seated properly, particulates will bypass the filter and bag, spewing dust and debris into the air.

10. Eliminating products that leave a scent in the room. Cleaning should leave no odor. Most fragrances added to a cleaning product do not enhance its effectiveness, but do irritate eyes and airways.

Best practices that have minimal costs include:

1. Providing faculty and administrative staff with a spray bottle of an approved green cleaning product for use when necessary, along with instructions for its use.

2. Establishing a written policy that is distributed to all members of the school community that states "No parent, teacher or staff member may bring into the school any consumer product which is intended to clean, deodorize or disinfect.

3. Installing multi-level scraper walk-off mats with nitrile rubber backing inside entranceways and outside where possible. They should be 15 – 20 feet long, span the entire entryway and be rotated on an appropriate schedule for weather conditions. Up to 90% of the dirt brought into schools comes from the soles of shoes. This essential green cleaning practice protects floors by stopping dirt at the door, makes floors easier to clean, and safer by reducing slipping. Walk-off mats can reduce the amount of tracked in dirt by about 70% and is a highly effective way of preventing contaminants from entering the building.

Best practices that pay for themselves over time:

1. Replacing traditional mops and cleaning rags with microfiber mops and cleaning cloths. Microfiber mops and cloths clean using just water or reduced amounts of chemicals. They are made of polyester and nylon fibers that trap everything from large dirt and dust particles to bacteria and can be cleaned in a washing machine and reused hundreds of times. Color-coded microfiber cleaning systems prevent cross-contamination. One study showed a 60% cost savings for mops, a 95% reduction in chemical costs and a 20% labor savings per day after using microfiber mops for a year.

2. Adopting a portion-control system using premeasured or automatic mixing and dispensing units eliminates mistaken measurements. Using a dilution station can reduce product consumption/waste by 30-65%.

3. Using HEPA or Green Label certified high performance vacuums to provide superior soil removal, dust containment and carpet appearance retention.

Best practices to be considered when choosing flooring products during renovation or construction:

1. Factoring in maintenance and disposal costs vs. initial purchase and installation costs. Over the lifespan of a floor, maintenance costs can exceed the initial costs by a factor of 2.5 to 25 times the initial cost of installation.

2. There are many new flooring alternatives to be considered which eliminate the need for toxic cleaning and maintenance products.

3. Carpeting in schools should be avoided because of the high VOC content of most new carpeting and the fact that carpeting retains many allergens and chemicals tracked in by shoes.

4. Environmental Choice (www.environmentalchoice.com) lists a "green" floor care program.

Green Cleaning In Schools Is Cost Effective

"These green changes are making the job easier and safer for custodians as well as saving money. You can go green and not impact the budget."

Dave Fortin, Region 10 Building/Grounds Supervisor
Burlington, Connecticut Public Schools
(Bristol Press, October 2008)

In Connecticut, Fortin has made a few simple yet powerful changes that make the cleaning process more effective, efficient as well as more fiscally and environmentally responsible.

He has done this by using:

1. New microfiber mops and cleaning cloths that pick up more dirt and can be laundered. Microfiber cleaning can reduce and/or eliminate the use of chemicals.

2. Concentrated, environmentally safe cleaners, hand soaps and detergents that reduce the number of plastic containers the school orders and saves money on shipping charges.

Hundreds of school districts across the country have switched from toxic cleaning products to safer alternatives. Here are just a few examples of school green cleaning programs that experienced no increased costs or significant cost savings.

For example:

Georgia

Replacing 20 different cleaning products with a single Green Seal certified cleaner, produced a $280,000.00 annual savings at the Riverside Military Academy in Gainesville, Georgia. Green Seal certified cleaners keep 270 dorm rooms and 100 bathrooms clean.

Florida

After saving $512.86 in one school during a 3 month pilot program, the Palm Beach County District began to phase in green cleaning into all of its 180 schools in June 2008. Projected annual savings for the entire district $360,000.00.

Pennsylvania

The Northern Tioga County School District saved $19,882.00 within one year by eliminating aerosols and other hazardous cleaning products. Ounce for ounce, aerosols often are more expensive than other cleaning solutions and emit harmful fumes that are inhaled by building occupants.

Illinois

From 2003-2004, the Chicago Public Schools tested its green cleaning program and found the price of Green Seal certified cleaning products were cost competitive with traditional products. This study also concluded that the vast array of cleaning products now available performed as well, if not better than traditional products.

Effective green cleaning and indoor air quality programs have been shown to reduce absenteeism which saves school districts money. The US EPA's IAQ Design Tools for Schools cites increases in Average Daily Attendance (ADA) as a primary benefit to schools with superior indoor air quality. "The majority of a school's operating budget is directly dependent on ADA, so even a small increase can significantly boot the operating budget."

For example:

Schools in **Syracuse, New York** documented gains in attendance of 11.7% which yielded added state funding of $2,512,250.00 the first year after using a cleaning for health regime. The school district's use of high efficiency filter back pack vacuuming, systematic disinfecting of desks and surfaces were among the measures used in the program.

Lockport Township High School in **Lockport, Illinois** reported a 3 percent increase in the average daily attendance after the first year of implementing an Indoor Air Quality Management Plan that included switching to Green Seal certified products and changing to vacuums equipped with HEPA filters.

Charles Young Elementary School in **Washington, DC** implemented a green cleaning and indoor air quality program that resulted in an increase in school attendance from 89% to 93%.

School districts can purchase green cleaning products through their state procurement contracts, which can offer major discounts through bulk purchasing agreements. Such procurement contracts as well as buying cooperatives and the bidding process can offer cost savings to schools.

For example:

Massachusetts

Massachusetts was one of the first states to offer safer alternatives to toxic cleaning products through state contracts as a part of its Environmentally Preferable Program.
An evaluation of its safer cleaning products demonstrated that the majority of these environmentally preferable cleaning products were less expensive than their toxic counterparts.

CT Foundation for Environmentally Safe Schools
A nonprofit organization dedicated to promoting policies, practices and resources that protect school occupants from environmental health hazards
www.pollutionfreeschools.org
888-420-5526

Green Cleaning: Safer, Affordable and Effective

NO ADDITIONAL COSTS

The official position of the National Work Group for Green Cleaning and Chemical Policy Reform in Schools is that the process of switching from traditional cleaning products to safer alternatives (certified by an independent third party) is cost neutral. This workgroup coordinated by the Healthy Schools Network, Inc. is comprised of the American Federation of Teachers, American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees International, Green Purchasing Institute, Green Schools Initiative, New York State United Teachers, INFORM, Green Seal, National Association of School Nurses, American Lung Association of Maine, and Massachusetts Committee on Occupational Safety and Health and MA Healthy Schools.

The following government procurement agencies have reported that switching to safer cleaning products (certified by an independent third party) did not cost more (US EPA, 2005):

- The US Dept. of Interior (including several National Parks)
- The states of Illinois, Massachusetts, Minnesota, Pennsylvania, Missouri and Vermont
- The city of Seattle, Washington
- Sarasota County, Florida and Alameda County, California
- Chicago Public Schools

COST SAVINGS and OTHER BENEFITS

Santa Monica, California:
- Documented a five percent savings after switching to safer cleaning products.
- Eliminated the use of 3,200 pounds of hazardous materials by replacing traditional cleaning products with safer alternatives (New American Dream)

PRODUCT and COST EFFECTIVENESS VERIFIED

Green Seal, Inc., an independent, third-party certification organization, conducted highly controlled onsite evaluations in Santa Monica, California, the Chicago Public Schools and the state of Massachusetts These evaluations not only demonstrated that the safer cleaning products were "cost competitive" or "cost neutral" but they worked as well, if not better. (New American Dream)

Costs and Consequences of Using Traditional Cleaning Chemicals

1. Five billion pounds of chemicals are consumed annually in the US to maintain institutions such as schools. The majority of these products are derived from nonrenewable resources.*

2. Exposures of expectant mothers to household chemicals (including cleaners) has been linked to the development of persistent wheezing in their offspring as well as a 41% increased risk of developing asthma by the age of seven. (European Respiratory Journal 2008)

3. One out of three cleaning products contains ingredients known to cause human health problems, as well as environmental contaminants that add to water and air pollution.*

4. Cleaning products are responsible for eight percent of the total nonvehicular emissions of VOCs (volatile organic compounds) which can trigger respiratory problems such as asthma, contribute to smog formation and inhibit plant growth.*

5. Toxic cleaning chemical use damages our health and burdens society with increased health care, lost work and reduced productivity. For example:

- US institutions currently spend more than 75 million dollars annually on medical expenses and lost wages for custodians due to injuries from using chemicals.*

- Studies show 6 out of 100 janitors using traditional cleaning products experience chemical-related injuries (burns to eyes and skin every year).*

- One study estimated that the use of safer cleaners in combination with better ventilation would produce a productivity gain worth between 30 and 150 billion dollars.*

- Twelve percent of work-related asthma can be linked to cleaning product exposures (Journal of Occupational and Environmental Medicine, 2003)

- The annual cost for healthcare and lost productivity associated with asthma is estimated by the National Heart, Lung and Blood Institute to be $16 billion.

6. Some traditional cleaning products are dangerous and present health, safety and security risks because they are highly flammable and can produce deadly gases when mixed.*

As an example, in July 2008, a 17 year old employee of a Fairfield, CT restaurant received chemical burns to 60 percent of his body. The injury occurred when he kicked over bleach and oven cleaner while suffering an epileptic seizure. The CT Departments of Public Health and Environmental Protection were called in to neutralize the chemical spill to nonhazardous levels and ventilate the building with positive pressure fans. Some first responders became contaminated as a result of off gassing and direct contact with the victim. (Fairfield Citizen, July 2008)

* See A Clean Sweep: Purchaser's Are Buying Safer, Effective and Affordable Cleaning Chemicals by Scot Case (Center for a New American Dream) published in Government Procurement Magazine. (Spring 2005)

CT Foundation for Environmentally Safe Schools
A nonprofit organization dedicated to promoting policies, practices and resources that protect school occupants from environmental health hazards
www.pollutionfreeschools.org
888-420-5526

Suggestions to Improve Raised HB 6496: An Act Concerning Green Cleaning Products in Schools

1) To eliminate possible fiscal impacts to school districts please
   - Delete vacuum cleaners from line 8
   - Give schools the option of mailing the green cleaning policy or sending it home with students

2) To accommodate where individual schools do not have a website, allow postings of ED050 School Facilities Survey, green cleaning policy (line 75) and five year inspection reports (line 208) to be posted on individual school websites and/or Board of Education websites.

3) Change the phrase "On or after" to "On or before" in lines 12 and 56, otherwise requirements can occur at any time in the future, even 5 or 10 years from the date specified.

4) Update the FIFRA language on lines 8-11 (to match the new language required by PA 08-186 and found in the CT DAS website) by adding after line 11: "or products for which no guidelines or environmental standards have been established."

5) On line 34, please change the word "by" to "and". On line 35, please change "inspecting" to "inspects".

6) In lines 60-63, staff should also be notified. There should also be a requirement to notify new hires and the parents or guardians of transfer students during the school year (to match the language of the pesticide notification law). Also, on line 62 the word "or" should be changed to "of".

5

State of Connecticut

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

STATE CAPITOL
HARTFORD, CONNECTICUT 06106-1591

REPRESENTATIVE LONNIE REED
ONE HUNDRED SECOND ASSEMBLY DISTRICT

LEGISLATIVE OFFICE BUILDING
ROOM 4071
HARTFORD, CT 06106-1591
HOME. (203) 481-4474
CAPITOL. (860) 240-8585
TOLL FREE. 1(800) 842-8267
FAX. (860) 240-0206
E-MAIL. Lonnie Reed@cga.ct.gov

MEMBER
ENERGY AND TECHNOLOGY COMMITTEE
GENERAL LAW COMMITTEE
PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

Representative Lonnie Reed
Testimony in support of HB 6496
AN ACT CONCERNING GREEN CLEANING PRODUCTS IN SCHOOLS

How much evidence does one need to know that kids and harsh chemical cleaning products are an unhealthy combination?

The spikes in Asthma and other allergy conditions that we are seeing among student populations and the mounting evidence about the future health consequences of inhaling or absorbing powerful compounds throughout the school day as they circulate through ventilation systems and radiate from every nook and cranny of a well scrubbed school—these are all concerns that can and should be addressed by greening our cleaning. It is now possible to obliterate germs and disinfect surfaces by using a growing number of proven products that are safer for people and friendlier to the environment.

Since I am not eager to inflict impossible state mandates on our schools, I've spoken with our Branford Board of Education Chair, our Schools Superintendent Dr. Kathleen Halligan, and our talented and pro-active Facilities Manager Mark Deming who has led the way in Branford for Energy savings that include a Tri-Generation plant in our High School and the implementation of energy efficiencies in our middle and elementary schools. They all encouraged me to co-sponsor HB 6496, explaining that Branford Schools have already begun the process of trading in harsh cleaners for effective and available green cleaners.

Two additional key selling points offered by this bill include the ability for schools to transition from harsh products to green products and the opportunity to buy in bulk through the CT Department of Administrative Services and therefore avoid increased costs for these improved products in such an uncertain economy.

Offering safer cleaning products for our school janitorial staff is also a big plus, since they are on the front lines when it comes to interacting with harsh cleansers.

And Superintendent Halligan also pointed out that Teachers, Administrators, Coaches and support personnel would applaud this effort to clean green as well.

For all of these reasons, and with our Branford School system's enthusiastic encouragement, I am proud to support HB 6496. Thank you.

SERVING BRANFORD